



3 1761 07472528 4

AR FROM A QUAKER
POINT OF VIEW



JOHN W. GRAHAM, M.A.

H&SS

A

5979




Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
MRS. H. S. HUNTER

J. Squire

WAR

FROM A QUAKER POINT OF VIEW



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

WAR

FROM A QUAKER POINT OF VIEW

BY

JOHN W. GRAHAM, M.A.

Principal of Dalton Hall, University of Manchester

AUTHOR OF "EVOLUTION AND EMPIRE"

LONDON

HEADLEY BROTHERS

BISHOPSGATE

LIBRARY

757750

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST -	7
2. THE PRACTICE OF CHRIST -	10
3. THE SPIRIT RATHER THAN THE LETTER - - -	12
4. CHRISTIANITY NON-POLITICAL -	14
5. THE TWO SWORDS PASSAGE -	16
6. THE EARLY FATHERS - -	23
7. LATER MYSTICAL SECTS - -	32
8. EARLY QUAKERISM AND PEACE -	34
9. LATER QUAKERISM AND PEACE -	42
10. QUAKER EXPERIENCE - -	44
11. THE TRAGEDY OF THE CASE -	51
12. IS THERE A PLACE FOR FORCE? -	58
13. OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE WAR	62
14. THE SOLDIER AND THE POLICEMAN	69
15. THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL	72
16. WAR AS A MORAL TONIC - -	77
17. POSSIBLE LINE OF PROGRESS THROUGH INTERNATIONAL FORCE - - - -	81
18. THE ULTIMATE VISION - -	91

	PAGE
19. OBSTACLE 1.—THE LACK OF A STRONG DEMOCRACY - -	93
20. OBSTACLE 2.—THE EXISTENCE OF CONQUERED NATIONS -	96
21. OBSTACLE 3.—A WRONG THEORY OF CONQUEST - - -	98
22. WHY WE CANNOT ENLIST IN A “ JUST ” WAR - - -	105
23. THE RELATIVITY OF MORAL OBLIGATION - - -	107
24. PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE -	110

WAR

FROM A QUAKER POINT OF VIEW

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

I. No lengthy proof is needed to show that the Christianity of Christ is actively hostile to all war. "God is Love" is the theological sanction to Christian conduct, and so excludes war. The fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control. How would these do as nine standards for nine divisions of an army? No amount of genial allowance for poetic exaggeration or oriental epigram can change the command to turn the other cheek and to love your enemies into a maxim for military tactics. "The Soldier's Pocket Book" is an elaborate and detailed denial of the Golden Rule.

This hostility to war is no mere accident. It follows from the Christian conception of God as revealed in Christ. It follows from

the Divine Presence in man, from human brotherhood, from belief in justice, from disbelief in force, from the whole spiritual doctrine of human life. War blows away and fouls the soul in reckless tempest.

In examining the words of our Lord it is not necessary to treat the Sermon on the Mount as though it were an ethical text book, every word in which was to be taken literally and baldly like a stage in Euclid's propositions. That would be a grave fault of interpretation. It is plain that we are not dealing here with a sermon at all, but with a summary, in the manner of Matthew, of our Lord's Galilean teachings. The passages collected into one place by Matthew are to be found scattered in many places in the Gospel of Luke.* They

* In his 6th, 8th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, and 16th chapters, in fifteen passages altogether; and one can hardly believe that all these fifteen passages uttered by Christ together in the Sermon on the Mount, were all repeated afterwards at different times, that they were all recorded by one evangelist as part of the Sermon, and only in one case ("If thine eye offend thee") repeated, but that the other evangelist wrote an account of the Sermon in his 6th chapter, including only 30 verses out of 111, but inserted all the rest in scattered passages. It is clear that we have in Luke his characteristic attempt to put teachings in their right historical setting. It is also obvious that no good teacher would attempt to teach so much of a varied kind in one address, and in so condensed a form.

constitute the texts of sermons or the memorable sayings, perhaps those frequently repeated. Such repetition may account for there being two differing collections of Beatitudes. We do not know what qualifying words or what context may have accompanied them. No honest interpreter, also, can pretend that in daily life we even begin to obey literally such commands as to give to every one who asks us and to lend freely without security. We are aware that that would be wrong ; it would soon reduce society to confusion and ourselves to poverty. Nor do we understand the exhortation to take no thought for the morrow as forbidding us to insure our lives, or arranging to meet future financial demands upon us.

But all these passages have, in fact, a very easily comprehended meaning. We are to be liberal and open-handed, we are not to spend our strength in worrying over the means of life, but are to live with some of the careless gladness of the birds and the lilies of the field ; we are to live with the melody of the bird and the colour and scent of the lily, instead of being overwhelmed by grinding care. The expression " Resist not evil " then, must be subject to the same canon of interpretation.

Nevertheless all these qualifying considerations cannot make our Lord's teaching mean the exact opposite of what it says. "Love your enemies" cannot by any possible exegesis come to mean "Hate the enemy." "Do good to them that hate you," cannot be translated into "Slay their men and bombard their towns." The whole meaning and spirit of the teaching is irreconcilably hostile to all war. We cannot imagine Jesus Christ as an Uhlan, nor as working a machine gun and mowing down His brethren.

THE PRACTICE OF CHRIST.

2. We have, as it happens, a definite case in which, as usually interpreted, the alternative of war and peace had to be chosen by our Lord, and it shows His attitude towards a career even of the most moral and beneficent conquest. I allude to the incident in the Temptation where the devil is recorded as having taken Him up into a high mountain and shown Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. "These will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." Jesus had taken the title "Son of Man," a technical term well-known in the current apocalyptic

literature* as secretly signifying the national deliverer. If war for Jewish liberty and a world ruled in righteousness under Jesus Christ was a thing to be rejected, we may safely believe that war waged by any of the European Powers, to safeguard their interests cannot be defended.

Our Lord's attitude towards the Samaritans, again, affords another illustration of how He dealt with racial and religious antagonisms. The Samaritans, a mixed race, were occupying part of the Holy Land, and claimed a rival seat of Jehovah. Surely this was a case in which "national honour" in the modern sense was involved. But Jesus uttered the parable of the Good Samaritan, and refused to call down fire from heaven upon one of their villages. He expressly included them in the exhortation to love our neighbours as ourselves.

Our Lord's cleansing of the Temple is given as an instance of His use of violence by those who have not read the passage, John ii. 15, R.V. carefully. "He made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and the

* Particularly in the Fourth Book of Enoch, which is full of it. The earliest use of it in this sense is in Dan. vii. 13-14.

oxen." A moment's reflection would make anyone realise that the scourge was needed for the animals ; then the men had to follow.

THE SPIRIT RATHER THAN THE LETTER.

3. It is quite true that there is not to be found in the New Testament any definite instruction—"Thou shalt not make war." Neither is there any passage on gambling, on slave-holding, on polygamy, on suicide, on luxurious expenditure, on speculation, on demoralising recreations, nor on the observance of Sunday ; in fact on extremely few of the questions on which we moderns desire guidance is it to be found given in detail. On all these matters the earnest enquirer may find principles which may guide him ; and that is exactly what he finds in regard to war. "Texts" in fact have been found to throw at reformers on every moral question. A reference to Timothy's stomach was good enough for teetotallers ; the domestic habits of the Old Testament have been quoted to defend slavery in America and polygamy in Utah. "The poor ye have always with you," has sometimes seemed a sufficient answer to those who would

attack poverty as a wrong thing in a Christian land; the Apostle Paul's views on women have had to be discounted by modern champions of the equality of the sexes. Social reformers have always been obliged to appeal to the spirit of the Gospel, rather than to the letter of the Bible.

In fact the books of the New Testament were all what might be called "occasional" writings, evoked by an immediate need, and neither the Lord nor any of His Apostles ever sat down to write a text-book, like the law of Moses, or the Koran of Mohammed. There exists no apostolic "Treatise on Christian Duty." We may be thankful that it is so, for the written word remains unchangeable, whereas the spirit is adaptable to every need. A fixed detailed code either would have been neglected by this time as obsolete, and so have discredited our whole faith, or it would have acted as an intolerable drag on conscience. Probably both evils would have occurred here or there. There are many great blanks in our system of conduct still, so that a code of Christian morality issued even at this enlightened date would hereafter become obsolete. We are still too comfortable about the existence of poverty, we have hardly moralised

our empire and the exploitation of natives, and we still permit great suffering among animals. It is therefore as well that we have no word, "Thou shalt not make war," if it implied a fixed code. Nevertheless, we have an analysis of war, sufficiently damaging. "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust and have not: ye kill and cannot obtain. Ye fight and war, yet ye have not."*

EARLY CHRISTIANITY NON-POLITICAL.

4. The early Christians did not set out by attacking the established institutions which they found in the world. They were loyal subjects of the Roman Empire,† though it partook of the evils of all military rule. They did not make any attack upon slavery. The Apostle Paul returned the runaway slave Onesimus to his master Philemon. The question of war was not a particularly pressing one in the age of Christ. Men lived under the shelter of the "Roman Peace." In fact, our Lord lived at the one signal pause in the story of perpetual war

* James iv. 1-2.

† Romans xiii.

which ancient history records. It is therefore no matter for surprise that centurions were treated with friendliness and that soldiers were told by the Baptist to be content with their wages, not told to disband. That they were also told to do violence to no man shows that they were really keepers of order: in practice they did the work of policemen.

The Christian treatment of all evils which were inwoven into the texture of society and government, was the only sensible, even the only possible one. It is an illustration of the truth that you cannot compel any great reform; and that the framework of the State has got to be made out of the convictions of the people, as surely as the honeycomb is made by the secretion of the bees. The Light of the Gospel and all other beneficent light comes not like destroying lightning, but like the silent spread of sunrise. "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Nevertheless, as surely as Christianity has so accelerated the growth of the moral sense, that it has very largely put down slavery, polygamy, torture, cruelty to the insane, to the criminal, to the child, to the woman, so surely we have Christ on our side in the war against war.

THE TWO SWORDS PASSAGE.

5. There is one puzzling passage, the one about the two swords.* It has had a strange history. In the Middle Ages it was the proof text of the spiritual and temporal, that is the double, power of the Pope. It has been a stumbling block to the advocates of peace, and appears in flat contradiction to our Lord's other teaching, and more particularly to the words which follow a few verses later, where the use of swords is reproved—"Suffer ye thus far. All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The real significance of this pathetic incident is shown by the fact that our Lord was in verses 35 to 38 reversing the whole of an earlier instruction—" 'When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything?' And they said 'Nothing.' Then said He unto them: 'But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.'

* Luke xxii. 35-38,

And they said, 'Lord, behold, here are two swords.' And he said unto them, 'It is enough.' " (A.V.).

The passage runs more consecutively if we suppose that the reference to a fulfilment of prophecy may perhaps have been due, as fulfilments of prophecy have often been due, to the Evangelist, not to our Lord. The presence or absence of such reference does not affect the interpretation seriously, though it has induced the revisers to alter the A.V. text and translate the ordinary every-day Greek word for "end" by "fulfilment," relegating what is confessed to be the meaning of the "Greek" to the margin. This has obscured the meaning of the passage. Dr. Moffatt's new translation has it, "Yes, there is an end to all that refers to me." This carries the right sense of *τέλος*, and connects with the prophecy also. It is surely correct if we accept the prophecy as there quoted. If we do not, it is not needful to give so long a rendering of *τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει*.

The word "fulfilment" will not do as a translation. The view here advocated has the support of Thayer's Lexicon under *τέλος*. In no place does it mean fulfilment of prophecy. There is also an important parallel passage

in Mark iii. 26, where it is said that "Satan hath an end"—τέλος ἔχει—the exact phrase here.

The translation "fulfilment" was evidently caused by the inclusion of a prophecy characteristic of early interpolation, though not certainly interpolated. But the meaning is plain. The old idealism had been lost. Light comes, as said above, from the consideration that it is not only non-resistance, which for a moment our Lord appeared to be abandoning; He gave a reversal of His other earlier instructions to His missionaries. No more were they to rely upon such provision as had been granted to Elijah, no longer was the armour of innocence to be their sufficient defence; they were to take money and provisions as the worldly wise do, for it was all over with Him, "the things concerning me have an end." The disciples did not perceive the despair in the Master's words; and, indeed, the Christian Church has not, so far as I know, perceived it either. They said they had two swords, and He was too wearied to continue, and just said "Enough, Enough." This is Dr. Moffatt's translation of *ικανόν ἐστι*.

But when the moment of trial came, His hope and faith had returned, and in the presence

of actual violence He was once more in possession of all His powers, and forbade, as we should expect, the use of the sword.

Is it impossible to accept this really plain interpretation? It ought not to be impossible to accept any interpretation which the text properly judged demands. It is a human touch, doubtless, but it is all the more credible for that.* There are many signs that the early text underwent modifications, all in the direction of emphasising the Divine at the expense of the human Christ.† This was in accord with a system of doctrine which regarded these attributes as opposed or contrasted, and not easily reconcilable. Christians of the ages after Christ did not build His Divinity upon His humanity as a basis, and were not able to rejoice equally in the characteristics of both. We may to-day, however, liken His divinity to the scent given off by the flower of His humanity, and rejoice in the vigour of the flower. The result of this steady pressure of early opinion on the text is to make us value all the

* There is also the view that the whole saying is sad irony. This does not appeal to me personally; but it also implies no warrant for the use of swords.

† See F. C. Conybeare in *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

more the human touches that have survived the chipping of the builders of dogma.

The word τέλος translated "end" may be paralleled with the kindred word τετέλεσται translated "It is finished," uttered at the end on the Cross.* We cannot tell what was in the mind of our Lord when He made that last cry: "It is finished." I have heard it described as triumphant, and have even heard it quoted to support what is called "the finished work" of Christ. But there is no evidence. It may have been a cry of grief. No one will ever know. Probably the right clue may be gained from the other sad word on the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" † Have we ever imaginatively realised what this forsaken cry meant? One needs oneself to have felt forsaken by God to have any idea of it. Perhaps few of us have ever been through such a baptism. To one whose whole life had been a steady communion with His Father, from whom again and again strength had come for the strenuous day, this sense of desolation must have been a lonely blank unspeakable. The Father had assuredly not forsaken Him. But

* John xix. 30.

† Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

the human body and brain were broken, had ceased to act, could neither know nor respond. In face of this undoubted experience, there should be no difficulty in accepting the analogous access of darkness the evening before, with the words, "The things concerning me have an end." That is, these words introduce nothing incongruous with what we know already in "It is finished," and the "forsaken" cry.

The abiding attitude taken by our Lord at this crisis of His self-sacrifice is that, believing that He had at His service, with a mere word of prayer, "twelve legions of angels," He saw that self defence was not in the line of His duty; and deliberately chose torture and ignominy. "This is your hour and the power of darkness."

What shall we think of this depression—this momentary loss of hope under the prospect of horrible torture? To me it makes more real the human sufferings of our Lord. Not encased in some Divine armour which fortified Him against the weakness of nerve and flesh to which we are liable, but in all points tempted and tried as we are, He gains all the more upon our loyalty and affection by touches like this. If at this dark moment, our Lord could have foreseen the multitude

whose spirits He would liberate, whose souls He would save to repentance and service, He would hardly have been baptised with a baptism so terrible as that which has afflicted some of His followers.

How many of the noblest and best of men have, it may be in the weakness of old age which comes before death, suffered from what we gently call depression, and do not wish to probe into further. But depression means just this kind of feeling, just this loss of touch with God, with hope, just this sense of failure. We put it down, rightly enough, when it occurs amongst our own family and friends, as a failure of the bodily machinery by which the soul expresses itself. We do not blame the aged Christian for it, but we say that his nerves are worn out, that the strain upon him has broken the physical and psychical organs through which the soul functions. And so in this our Lord's final strain and agony, in this passion and bloody sweat, it is not hard to realise that for a moment He thought that the things concerning Him had come to an end.*

* Ambrose and Origen tackle this passage. Neither accepts it as sanctioning the use of arms; but their ways out are more patristic than modern.

THE EARLY FATHERS.

6. We naturally turn to the conduct of the earliest Christians in the sub-apostolic age to find out whether they entered the army and fought along with their fellow citizens as a matter of course, or whether, on the other hand, Christianity acted as a ferment working through a great mass of dough, penetrating as far as it could, but strongest at the beginning. This latter is what happened, and I take the time at which the testimony against war ceased exhausted (officially) to be the absorption of the Church in the State under the Emperor Constantine, soon after the year 312 A.D. The first action of the ferment was the most vigorous, while it was still in its full strength; then its vigour gradually faded away. The Church began with the apostolic attitude, "Our warfare is not against flesh and blood," (Eph. vi. 12) and "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal." (1 Cor. x. 4).*

It is well-known that we have hardly any records of the earlier half of the second century,

* It is interesting to note that the Essenes, whose ethic has so strong a likeness to that of Jesus in other respects, refused, according to Philo, to manufacture instruments of war.

but such evidence as exists is clear. We may divide the period from Christ to Constantine into two halves and state that up to about the year 150 A.D. at least, Christians recognised that they could personally have nothing to do with war. They made the distinction which everyone has to make between what may be right for the individual and what you can reasonably expect the state to do. Harnack, who may be taken as a very high authority, says that during this period the question as to whether a Christian might be a soldier did not even exist in the Christian Churches.* He adds that we have every reason to suppose that no Christian *became* a soldier, though it is possible that some who were converted when already in the army did not at once leave it. We have, however, numerous records of the sufferings and martyrdoms of some who did leave it for conscience sake, for such a testimony could only be kept by being faithful unto death.† Tertullian, writing about the year 200 A.D. in his "De

* "Militia Christi," page 47, quoted by W. E. Wilson "Christ and War," page 70. The fact that Harnack is supporting the present war (1915) shows how little influence tradition really has even upon devout men.

† See Dymond. "Essays on Morality," p. 511, and "Essay on War."

Corona Militis," recommends Christians to leave the army, but was inclined to treat mildly cases of difficulty in doing so.

"Warfare could not be wholly condemned in such as having become Christians while they were soldiers, persevered in their calling, so far as nothing was done inconsistent with their steadfastness in the faith."*

Justin Martyr (140 A.D.), in his "Apology," said Christians did not fight, but counted the Devil as the source of war, and Christianity as the fulfilment of the prophecy that swords should be turned into ploughshares.† The great Irenæus, the leading Christian in Gaul from 180 to 202 A.D., and a chief director of the policy of the whole Church, expressed a like view.‡ This is the more significant, as the whole drift of Irenæus was to find correct teaching in oral tradition from the Apostles, through the Church officers. Tatian, harmonist and apologist, whose combined edition of the Gospels nearly supplanted the original four, declared that war and Christianity were incompatible.

* "De Corona Militis," chapter II.

† "Trypho. Apol. 2," and Ad Zenam.

‡ He said Christians no longer knew how to fight. Adv. Haer. iv. 34.

Tertullian (A.D. 200), the leading Christian of his time, prop of the Catholic Church, protagonist against the heathen, and in sympathy with the Montanists, the most spiritually-minded branch of the Church, wrote most fully and earnestly that Christ in disarming Peter had disarmed every soldier. Litigation was unsuitable for Christians, much more battles.* Clement of Alexandria was easy with those already under the military oath, but agreed as to the rest of the teaching. Origen (A.D. 230), admitted the fact of the Christian aloofness from the army, and frankly defied the Imperial conscription.† Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (248-258), agrees with his great predecessors on this point, however much he differed from them on Church Government.‡ (He was the father of modern Episcopacy). His letters show that by this time there were a few Christians in the army of the province. We are now approaching the end of the golden age of the

* "De Corona Militis," Apol. capp. 21 and 37. De Idolol, capp 17, 18 and 19. Ad Scapulum cap 1. Adversus Jud. capp. 7 and 9. Adversus Gnost. cap. 13. Ad. Max. cap. 4. De Patientia, capp. 6 and 10.

† "Contra Celsum" III., 5 and 8. "In Josuam hom." xii. 9.

‡ Letter 56.

Church. Lactantius* continued the traditional protest into the time of Constantine; but when the conquering Emperor became a "Christian," the Church was fain to drop its testimony and enter the world of ordinary politics.

From the "Arbiter in Council"† I take the two following contrasted articles:—

Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, under Constantine (but early in his career), Canon 12: "Whosoever being called by grace have first shown their zeal and faith and have abandoned the military profession, but afterwards have returned to it like dogs to their vomit, let them be hearers for three, and penitents for ten years."

Synod of Arles, A.D. 353: "Those who cast away their arms in peace [*i.e.*, when Christians are not being persecuted] shall abstain from Communion."

These two edicts date with useful accuracy the official fall of a pure Christianity.

Robert Barclay, from whose Apology, Prop. xv., §13-15, I have taken a number of the above references, also notes passages against war in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Hieronymus, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and with much

* "De Just," v. 18, vi. 20.

† Chap. VII., p. 536.

variety and contradiction, even in Augustine. He remarks that the same Fathers who oppose judicial oaths, of whom he gives a long list, also oppose war. This is another instance of the truth that Quaker testimonies are no fortuitous concourse, but are the revival of a single coherent system of conduct taught by our Lord.

The strongest evidence, as often, is that of an opponent. Celsus, in his famous attack upon the Church, demanded what would happen to the Empire if everybody became a Christian and refused to fight. It is interesting that the critics of Christianity are those who are the most anxious to emphasise its peace testimony. Gibbon says that they refused civil and military employment,* and Milman, in his notes criticising Gibbon,†, admits that Christian practice on military employment was divided. There are passages which show that there began to be exceptional cases after 150 A.D. On the same page of Gibbon, we have a quotation by Guizot of a passage from Tertullian's "Apology," chapter 37: "Hesterni

* Chap. XV., section on "Virtues of the First Christians."

† Vol. II., pp. 188, 189.

sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa." (We are of yesterday, and we are to be found everywhere, in your towns, your islands, forts, free cities, market places, and your very camps). Tertullian has also, in his "Apology," chapter 42, the words, "Navigamus et nos vobiscum et militamus." (We sail with you and are your fellow soldiers). These passages show that about the year 200, the energetic testimony of such Fathers as Tertullian and Origen still maintained the Christian position which they had inherited from the earlier age, but that conformity on the part of less strongly convinced Christians existed. The story of the Thundering Legion under Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 174, though no miracle, inclines one to believe that there were some Christians in the army at that date. The Twelfth Legion was overcome by heat and thirst, and about to be attacked by the enemy. The story goes that in answer to the prayers of the very numerous Christians in it heavy rain fell, the soldiers caught the rain in their helmets, and the barbarians fled at the noise of the thunder, and that in consequence the Emperor ceased his persecution of the Christians. As

a matter of fact the Emperor himself credited Jupiter with the thunderstorm, and the great persecution at Lyons three years afterwards discredits the story of the decree of clemency ; but the tale comes from a Christian "Apology," published by Claudius Appollinaris, a contemporary Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. The Twelfth Legion wintered in Cappadocia at the end of A.D. 174, so that he doubtless heard it from the soldiers. The story is discredited by the fact that the Legion had been called the Thundering Legion ever since the time of Augustus, but we have to account for a story told by a contemporary Bishop.* There is a passage in Marcus Aurelius, quoted by Barclay, which seems to imply that there were Christians with the army, but not as fighting men. "I prayed to my country's gods ; but when I was neglected by them and observed myself passed by the enemy, considering the fewness of my forces, I called to one and entreated those who with us are called Christians, and I found a great number of them. And I forced them with threats which ought not to

* See Neander. Vol. I., pp. 157-160. Clark's Ed. My own view is that the soldiers hoaxed the good Bishop by telling him a pious story for his book.

have been, because afterwards I knew their strength and force. Therefore they betook themselves neither to the use of darts nor trumpets, for they use not so to do, for the cause and name of their God which they bear in their consciences."

It is enough for our purpose in discussing this period to see that the idealism of Jesus, bravely held for more than a century after His death, began gradually to weaken.

This weakening was still more marked during the Third Century, at the time when the Church was in other ways ceasing to be characteristically like its founder, was adopting a priesthood, creeds, and sacramental mysteries. After the catastrophe came, in the moment of apparent triumph with Constantine, we find the Church beginning to support the Empire in its wars, to annex the endowments and the temples of the heathen worship, and to employ persecution as the remedy for heresy. Such a Church abandoned its testimony against war along with much besides. "Thou hast been conquered, Galilean" would have been a truer exclamation to put into the lips of Constantine.

The best Christian thinkers have felt this

the most strongly. Dante (in J. A. Carlyle's translation) writes

"Ah Constantine! to how much ill gave birth, not thy conversion, but that dower which the first rich father took from thee."*

Milton translated this passage in his prose work "Of Reformation concerning Church Discipline in England" (1641). He adds also a translation of a savage Sonnet (No. 107) by Petrarch to the like effect, and a passage from Ariosto :—

"Then passed he to a flowery mountain green,
Which once smelt sweet, now stinks as odiously.
This was that gift (if you the truth will have)
That Constantine to good Sylvestro gave."†

Such was the verdict from Papal Italy in the ages of faith.

LATER MYSTICAL SECTS.

7. After Constantine the protest against all war is only heard from reformers and heretics. It is essentially a criticism of the State by the conscience, and when the Church, the organ of the corporate conscience, is itself absorbed by the

* "Inferno," xix. 115. Dante returns to the subject with great vigour in *Paradiso*, xx. 55.

† "Orlando Furioso," xxxvi. Stanza 80.

State, such criticism becomes impossible, or very difficult, because of the spokesmen of the Church being endowed with wealth and power (or at the lowest with maintenance and position), by the State, which has never yet felt that it could do without war.

But, though abandoned by the Catholic Church, the teaching of Christ has never quite ceased out of the world.* It is curious and instructive to note that the protest against war has been made by heretical bodies, all mystical in thought and strongly opposed to the sacerdotal hierarchy. They had, in fact, got back to Christ.† They included the Cathari, the Paterines in Italy in the eleventh century and after, the Albigenses to some extent, the Waldenses, the Franciscan Friars and Tertiaries, the Lollards most conspicuously, the early Moravians, such reformers as Erasmus,‡ the earlier Anabaptists, the Mennonites, and the Family of Love, founded by Henry Nicholas. A like view was common among the Socinians at the time of the Reformation. Nor have the Quakers stood

* See "Christ and War," by W. E. Wilson, chap. IV. "Voices in the Wilderness."

† Full accounts of these bodies may be found in "Studies in Mystical Religion," by Rufus M. Jones.

‡ See his commentary on Luke iii, and xxii,

alone in our own day. Testimony, costing martyrdom and imprisonment, has been borne by the Doukhobors in Russia, and during the latter and principal part of their history by the Bahais in Persia. These are said to number about a million, and it is to be feared that they are now having much hardness to endure. It would appear from all these cases that a determined hostility to war is not an isolated peculiarity which may crop up anywhere, but is found to accompany a pure mysticism, and to be a part of a certain spiritual tone and habit of mind.

EARLY QUAKERISM AND PEACE.

8. In all the campaigns of the founders of Quakerism, the flag they flew was inscribed, "Primitive Christianity Revived." Had their methods been those of the Salvation Army, this actual banner would have been unfurled in every market place in England. It formed, in any case, the burden of their plea and the constant appeal in their writings. They were hostile to the pagan elements which had corrupted the original gospel of Jesus, and this they interpreted by His living word within them.

What were such reformers to make of the universal assumption in all nations and churches that war was a necessity, and even that in many respects it was rather a fine thing? A few years passed by before the Society as a whole faced the issue. Although in the popular mind Quakerism has stood for Peace more than for any other single thing, Peace was not the heart of the Quaker message. It was only a very prompt deduction from it. Under the Commonwealth, whilst the Society was being gathered together, from 1652 onwards, there was some variety of utterance. Barclay puts Peace in his last proposition, among miscellaneous testimonies, such as removing the hat, taking the oath, or going to the theatre. He treats it with extreme brevity in his text, and does not even mention it in the proposition itself. Later generations have found that it must hold a larger relative place.

Quite early in his history, when lying in Derby gaol in 1650-1, under the Blasphemy Act, George Fox was invited to become a captain in the Commonwealth army. He declined, saying that he lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars. So he lay among the felons, filthily, for six

months more. He thus rang true from the beginning. Nevertheless, many religious teachers might go so far, might declare that, for themselves, they were out of the spirit of war, without seeing their way to formulate any testimony against it as a part of practical politics. In later years when William Penn consulted George Fox as to whether he ought to continue to wear his sword as part of the dress of a gentleman, he replied humorously, "Wear it as long as thou canst." This exactly expresses the position. It was an early and very general deduction from the consciousness of the indwelling Christ. On the other hand, we find Fox upbraiding the Protector for not carrying out a more vigorous Protestant foreign policy :—

"O Oliver, hadst thou been faithful and thundered down the deceit, the Hollander had been thy subject and tributary, Germany had given up to have done thy will, and the Spaniard had quivered like a dry leaf wanting the virtue of God, the King of France should have bowed his neck under thee, the Pope should have withered as in winter, the Turk in all his fatness should have smoked, thou shouldst not have stood trifling about small things, but minded the work of the Lord as He began with thee at first."*

* Devonshire House, Parchment-bound book in Portfolio 9, p. 79. Quoted by W. C. Braithwaite in "The Beginnings of Quakerism," p. 440.

Edward Burrough wrote, in 1659, an Epistle to the Cromwellian garrison at Dunkirk, urging them to "set up their standards at the gates of Rome," and "avenge the blood of the guiltless through all the dominion of the Pope."* Edward Burrough was a fiery young preacher, known as "the son of thunder and consolation," who founded the Quakerism of London, wore himself out, and died in prison when still only twenty-nine in 1662.

The question for many was really perplexing, for a large number of soldiers, probably many hundreds, from the famous army of the Commonwealth joined the Society, and the Early Friends looked to that wonderful force as the agent whereby their liberties and the cause of true religion had been preserved. Among the armies of history hardly any can have presented itself in such a favourable light to a religious body. "The Lord hath owned and honoured our English army and done great things for them and by them in these nations in our age."†

Early in 1660, however, the point was settled. The military disunion and the disturbances

* "Works," folio ed. pp. 536-538.

† Edward Burrough loc. cit.

which had followed on the death of the Protector in 1658 caused George Fox a period of depression at Reading, where he lay ill for ten weeks in 1659.* When "he rose from his travail with the witness of God," and "over all that hypocrisy which the outward professors were run into," and "came to have ease, and the light, power and Spirit shone over all," he wrote an Epistle, printed in the *Journal*, pp. 448-9, "lest any young or ignorant people should be drawn into the snare of faction." This Epistle breathes all through the most uncompromising doctrine of Peace.†

I think that a legitimate historical imagination aids one to fill in this brief story, and to conclude that the standard Peace testimony of Friends dates from George Fox's struggles at Reading for those ten weeks :—that in that loneliness he was working out for us his solution of the puzzle caused by the rival loyalties to the nation and to God. George Fox had no vocabulary of psychological analysis, his mind was strong and direct rather than subtle. (We are indeed left to guess what it was exactly that troubled his soul from 1642 to 1647.) But when he rose

* *Journal*, 8th Ed., p. 447.

† See also George Fox's "Epistles," pp. 103, 132.

from his bed at Reading and wrote an epistle on faction and on war, we need not hesitate as to the subject of his struggle.* It is my belief that each man for himself will have to go through some similar struggle for light on this great question. The same thoroughness with which Fox found the Indwelling Word destructive of an order of clergy, caused him to find the law of love inconsistent with the military profession. This Epistle is so epoch-making that I will quote part of it :

“All Friends, everywhere, keep out of plots and bustling, and the arm of flesh ; for all these are amongst Adam’s sons in the fall, where they are destroying men’s lives like dogs, beasts, and swine, goring, rending, and biting one another, destroying one another, and wrestling with flesh and blood. Whence arise wars and killing but from the lusts ? Now all this is in Adam in the fall, out of Adam that never fell, in whom there is peace and life. Ye are called to peace, therefore follow it ; and that peace is in Christ, not in Adam in the fall. All that pretend to fight for Christ, are deceived ; for his kingdom is not of this world, therefore his servants do not fight. Fighters are not of Christ’s kingdom, but are without Christ’s kingdom ; His kingdom stands in peace and righteousness, but fighters are in the lust ; and all that would destroy men’s lives, are not of Christ’s mind, who came to save men’s lives. Christ’s kingdom is not of this world ; it is peaceable : and all that

* The sequence in time may not be so close as this. W. C. Braithwaite, in his “Beginnings,” points out that the historical order in the *Journal* is confused here.

are in strife, are not of his kingdom. All that pretend to fight for the Gospel, are deceived ; for the gospel is the power of God, which was before the devil, or fall of man was ; and the gospel of peace was before fighting was. Therefore they that pretend fighting, are ignorant of the gospel ; and all that talk of fighting for Sion, are in darkness ; for Sion needs no such helpers. All such as pretend Christ Jesus, and confess Him, and yet run into the use of carnal weapons, wrestling with flesh and blood, throw away the spiritual weapons. They that would be wrestlers with flesh and blood, throw away Christ's doctrine ; the flesh is got up in them, and they are weary of their sufferings. Such as would revenge themselves, are out of Christ's doctrine. Such as being stricken on one cheek, would not turn the other, are out of Christ's doctrine ; and such as do not love one another, nor love enemies, are out of Christ's doctrine."

The address of Isaac Penington to the army belongs also to this critical juncture. It is undated, but is printed between two papers, dated 19. xi. 1659 and 14. xii. 1659. It was therefore written about the end of Eleventh Month, 1659, *i.e.*, about the end of January, 1660, according to our reckoning. The army badly needed an evangelist just then, and Isaac Penington responded to the call, concluding with the words, " Ah ! remember how often ye have started aside like a warped bow : become now at length upright to the Lord, carrying faithfully to the mark those

his arrows which he is shooting at the regions of Babylon. This is from one who waits for what the Lord will effect, and hopes at length to see an instrument in his hand wherein his soul will delight." The writer had only been a Friend about fifteen months, and his former attitude to the army still remained as a habit of mind. Fox's letter may not have reached him.

The behaviour of the army was soon to cure of their lingering loyalty any Friends who thought the Lord had done great things for it and by it (a phrase used both by Isaac Penington and Edward Burrough). Friends, already soldiers at their convincement, began to leave the army, and to be expelled from it, in considerable numbers. Individuals had begun to leave earlier. Finally, in 1660, a strong and definite "Declaration" was sent by George Fox and other Publick Friends to Charles II., setting forth the official opposition of the Society to all war, as being inconsistent with the spirit and teaching of Christ. This Declaration is still printed in the Book of Discipline, in Vol. II. of the current edition, p. 139. From that position, now definitely reached, there has never been any official retreat.

LATER QUAKERISM AND PEACE.

9. Near it is printed the paragraph issued in the Epistle of 1804, during the Napoleonic war, which, in its motive and circumstances, the nature of the country's danger, and the state of public opinion, resembles not distantly the present war against Germany.

It runs as follows :—

“ We feel bound explicitly to avow our continued unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our Divine Lord and Law-giver, and with the whole spirit and tenor of His Gospel ; and that no plea of necessity or of policy, however urgent or peculiar, can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe unto Him who hath said, “ Love your enemies.” To carry out such a profession consistently is indeed a high attainment, but it should be the aim of every Christian. It is a solemn thing to stand forth to the nation as the advocates of inviolable peace ; and our testimony loses its efficacy in proportion to the want of consistency in any amongst us.”

Friends at that time were, however, content to maintain a passive attitude, and to eschew propaganda ; for in the Epistle of the following year, 1805, Friends are advised not to make the war a topic of conversation and to be peaceful themselves in words and actions. At the same time they paid their militia fines

and went to prison where necessary. The Friends' family of Fox, at Falmouth, who were shippers, came, through no action of their own, into possession of a quantity of French prize money, and devoted much effort to find out by advertisement in France to whom they might return it as its rightful owners. This piece of unusual conscientiousness attracted the notice of certain kindred spirits in France. The result was that some bodies of separatists from the Catholic Church joined the Society of Friends, and maintained for two or three generations Friends' Meetings at Nîmes, Montpellier and Congénies in the South of France. These little bodies finally faded out. Conscription drove their young men from the country.

It is noticeable that to-day Friends are by no means minded to seek seclusion in time of war, but are using every effort that the press and public meetings place at their disposal to influence the nation in favour of a more democratic foreign policy, of justice, and friendly feeling towards the populations with whom we are at war, and of a permanent settlement which would produce a common federated organisation for peace and disarmament, in a

Europe whose map, we hope, may be divided on principles of nationality and not of empire.*

QUAKER EXPERIENCE.

10. My readers will naturally desire to know how the testimony has fared among Friends for two hundred and fifty years, and whether experience has shown it to be a tenable proposition. In England, for the most part, Friends' faith in it has not been greatly tried. It has been a simple matter to avoid joining the army or navy, militia or volunteers or territorials. Only in the days of the press-gang and the compulsory capture of sailors for our fleets in the Napoleonic wars has any difficult testimony had to be borne. It has been nobly borne when required both then and in early days.†

In Ireland a critical time arose in the rebellion

* From a return presented to the Yearly Meeting of 1915, it seems that over 300 Peace Meetings were held in the first nine months of the war, with many meetings also on Christ and War.

† For Richard Sellar's case see Besse's "Sufferings of the People called Quakers," Vol. II., p. 112, and a modern pamphlet by Joshua Rowntree (Northern Friends Peace Board, Thirsk Row, Wellington Street, Leeds.) For Thomas Lurting see W. C. Braithwaite, "The Beginnings of Quakerism," p. 521.

of 1798, when the Catholic rebels and the English troops were scattering terror and massacre through the country. Friends destroyed any guns which they might have for sporting purposes, and left themselves absolutely unprotected. Not a single one of the solitary Quaker homes was molested; not a single Friend lost his life, except one who had put on a uniform and used a rifle. They sheltered and fed the refugees from both sides, and were helpful in the restoration of peace. The triumph of the law of Christ was real and memorable.*

America has been the scene of the most extensive real test of Quaker principles. The story of Pennsylvania is, of course, the classical case, the "holy experiment." Throughout the frontier wars against the Indians, not only in Pennsylvania, but elsewhere, the policy of the Quaker colonists was never to carry arms, nor even to bolt their doors, and it resulted in their possessing a security which fire-arms could not give. This was strikingly the case in New England, in 1704, where the Irish experience was exactly foreshadowed. The Indians left the Quaker farms

* See Mary Leadbeater's Journal,

alone, devoting themselves to killing Presbyterians who had killed their people and taken their lands.*

Regarded as an example of a State existing without war and without soldiers, the "holy experiment" was not decisive, inasmuch as the province was a part of the British Empire and was defended by its armies and fleets. The British colonies were frequently involved in war with the French on their northern border, and the safety of Pennsylvania from conquest was ensured by the defence made by New York and New England. Demands for a subsidy for war purposes were frequently made by the Government on the Assembly of Pennsylvania and constituted a difficulty of principle. The matter was generally solved by a vote of supply to the Government for general purposes, the responsibility of its application being thus left to the home authorities. The amount was also generally below what was demanded. (The right to tax the colonies was, we shall remember, the occasion of the War of Independence afterwards.) It is not, however, in its relations with European powers that Pennsylvania was significant in freedom from war. There was a

* See Journal of Thomas Chalkley, pp. 40-46.

long dispute with Lord Baltimore's neighbouring province of Maryland about boundaries, which the colony of Pennsylvania by forbearance and moderation, was finally able to settle by arbitration when violence would have been an easy and natural resource. The story of the Maryland arbitration is extremely creditable to Pennsylvania, and was a valuable object lesson to the world.

The holy experiment did not come to an end through any inherent weakness, but through its connection with the imperial necessities of England. In 1756 the Seven Years War broke out, the central and critical struggle with France for the possession of the New World. The military people in England decided to abolish the autonomy of Pennsylvania, a course to which they had been constantly stimulated by the Anglican party in the colony in correspondence with their influential friends at home ; in fact the colonists had never been able to feel complete security of tenure. Friends in England took the matter up for them, and felt that the best they could do to save the autonomy of the colony was for Friends to undertake to resign their seats in the Assembly, where ~~they~~ they constituted a majority, though

but a small minority of the population.* Their elections were usually unopposed, and a seat was held peacefully for a great number of years by the same man. The majority of Friends carried out this bargain made on their behalf, and those who retained their seats were too few to govern the policy of the colony. The undertaking then given to take no further part in politics had disastrous consequences for the Society and the State, and has helped towards the corruption often associated with modern Pennsylvanian politics. Thus the suppression of the most hopeful political element in the American Colonies was part of the price we paid for the conquest of Canada.

If the advice of such colonial statesmen as James Pemberton and John Dickinson of Philadelphia had been taken, the troubles arising out of the Stamp Act might have been ended without war, a calamity brought on by the hotheads in Boston Harbour.† A small body of Friends who felt free to fight in 1775 separated from the general body in

* In 1770 Friends constituted one-seventh of the population of Philadelphia.

† See Isaac Sharpless. "The Quakers in the Revolution."

Philadelphia, and started a single Meeting House of their own on this question, but this body of "Free Quakers" was too small to survive.* The Society maintained its principles and practices intact throughout the revolutionary war. When the Civil War broke out in 1861 the difficulty was real and even insoluble. Friends had devoted themselves for many years to the freedom of the slave, they had formed the backbone and the hands and feet of the Abolitionist party, and to many of them there presented itself a choice of evils. To fight meant to abandon one dearly-loved principle, not to fight meant not to raise a hand for the maintenance of the unity of their country and the freedom of the negroes. In these circumstances a considerable number of young men went to the war. Their disciplinary treatment by the Society varied from complete forgiveness to disownment. The question of membership is a local question with Friends, decided by the Monthly Meeting, and Monthly Meetings differed. In the East, the rule against war was maintained with more severity than in the Middle States, and on the whole rather

* This branch organized in 1781 and held meetings till 1836. *Sharpless—Quakers in the Revolution.*

more severely among the "Orthodox" than among the "Hicksite" Friends.

It must, however, be admitted that we have here to record a partial departure under very difficult circumstances from the absoluteness of the testimony against all war. It is probable that in this tangled world it may be impossible at all times to maintain any definite rule of conduct without exceptions. At times the best one can do is to choose between two evils. Let those who have not been similarly tried refrain from passing judgment. Friends in the Southern States bore the full brunt of a really savage persecution for refusing the Confederate conscription. They were at times driven into the line of fire, but refused to shoot. Their thrilling story is told in "Southern Heroes in War Time."

At the present moment the handful of Friends in Australia and New Zealand is once more called upon to bear repeated imprisonments for the maintenance of their testimony against compulsory military drill. Already up to the end of 1913, twenty-one thousand boys had been prosecuted for refusing to serve, and only a hundred and twenty-two thousand had been drilled; over three thousand had been put into

gaol. Of this wide-spread resistance, the little body of Friends forms the steel spear point. If conscription were tried in England, no one in the Society has any hesitation whatever in promising the Government a similar experience on a larger scale.

Thus, to sum up, the Society has had to bear its testimony, in face, not only of foolish wars like those in the Crimea and South Africa, but of the most righteous wars waged by the most single-minded armies which have ever fought. The Society learnt its infant steppings, at first shaky, in the shadow of the friendly presence of the Ironsides. The very existence of European nations against Napoleon, its own cause of freedom for the American negro, and now the struggle against the military hegemony of Germany, have had to be considered by this body of Christian idealists. The record given above is one of a pertinacity which has needed to be well founded on faith, and on the whole has not failed.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE CASE.

II. The situation now and in all the above wars has been truly tragic. A tragedy is not

a mere calamity, nor a struggle between good and evil both confessed, but there is tragedy where good is pitted against good in hopeless conflict, or where we are in such a case that our choice lies only between two evils, as was the case in Greek tragedy. "Our citizenship is in heaven," but we have one on earth also. They call in different ways. Happily in this war a solution was found and vigorously followed up in ambulance, hospital, and other relief work, and in the many forms of national service which were needed at home. Though we cannot fire, we did not keep out of the firing line.*

In morals there can be no claim like that of a preferential creditor who must be completely satisfied before others receive anything. In a conflict of influences competing for our allegiance, our testimony for peace can claim no such isolated and privileged position. It must weigh along with other duties, relying only upon its natural strength. Claims to an

* Two large parties of Friends worked in France, an ambulance unit near the front in Flanders, with a base at Dunkirk, and another band of doctors, nurses, and other helpers, attempting to stave off epidemics in the desolated regions north-east of Paris. The Society also aided stranded alien enemies in England, and Belgian refugees. Also, by public meetings, it has held up the Christian principle, and has tried to prepare the public mind for a permanent peace.

overwhelming absoluteness attaching to some particular duty have caused most of the crimes which have been committed by good men. Loyalty to the Roman Church produced the Inquisition, and obedience to revealed truth as understood by the Protestant led Calvin to burn Servetus. A one-sided patriotism has much bloodshed to answer for in many a tribal slaughter. So that the "Peace-at-any-price party" is a mere nickname, and in spite of its vogue, does not represent a reasonable Quaker view. But the cause of Peace is inherently so strong, the crime of war is so dreadful in the intensity of its evil and in its widespread moral ruin, that there is needed no protective tariff to shield it from the competition of other moral claims. In war every happy human relationship is reversed; evil has become good, and men behave like madmen in a topsy-turvy world.

The present war has seen a revival of barbarism which has shocked mankind. This ruthlessness has flouted the Hague Conventions, and denied the validity of all international agreements; has broken down and discredited the humanising regulations which jurists have painfully built up through generations, to limit the cruelty of war, and to give some weight

to pity and humanity. The question has become suddenly grave, whether all this has gone for ever. Is it possible to civilise war, or is all this choking of soldiers, starving of prisoners, shooting of civilians, drowning of fishermen and passengers, burning of universities and bombarding of cathedrals, the ravaging and torture of the helpless in Belgium, is this what we must expect as the outcome of the destructiveness which is implicit in the very object of war? The answer is that these criminal excesses are due to the spirit of war when entirely unbridled, and they have been, logically enough, advocated by Clausewitz, the great German authority on making war, and followed with calculated pedantry and cool intention, by his school, the teachers of modern Germany. Nevertheless they must not be tolerated, nor war abandoned to its perfect fulfilment. Their horror shows war in its nakedness unredeemed; but civilised man need not, and at his peril must not, leave it thus unchecked. Pity, mercy, humanity—alien to war as they are—are essential parts of human and divine nature, and their place, even in warfare, must in the name of civilisation, be if possible restored.

The cause of the tragedy is, however, not obscure. We have lived in Europe under the spirit and rule of war, and of warlike ideas, always. There has never been, since the close of the Middle Ages, even the conception of a unified government and a unified justice, such as, amid all the bloodshed, remained at the back of the idealism which looked to the Holy Roman Empire and the Holy See for those blessings. It looked vainly for the most part, but still the thought of peace under a single empire and under the sway of a single spiritual potentate never quite died out of the world till the power of those who held so unworthily those great offices was destroyed by the Renaissance. We have since then relied on little but force for liberty, security and empire, though happily there are exceptions to so general a statement.

Europe has obeyed the maxim, "If you want peace prepare for war," that is, rely for security wholly upon fear. It is true that Great Britain has not been mainly responsible for this state of things, but it has not been possible for one nation to be saved alone. The nations of Europe must reform, if not absolutely together, at least not independently of one another. We have not succeeded

by our press and our diplomacy in imposing a better mind upon the militarism of the three European Empires. Nor are we ourselves quite fit to be saved for Peace. Our press has definitely contributed to the European strain; our armament interest has been influential, and our Imperialist period, 1884-1901, between the Egyptian War and the Boer War, and including both, though not aggressive upon Germany, increased her envy, and stimulated the Big Navy party there.

We have been witnesses of the reasoned worship of force, particularly in Germany, but also in Russia. There has ruled the mind of the conqueror, and Europe has lived under pride and fear. It has surely become plain at last even to the fighting lords that the attempt of every nation to be stronger than every other nation is an arithmetical impossibility, and the way to political destruction. The maxim that "If you want peace prepare for war," has been for ever discredited, and an object lesson has been given on a vast scale that for Europe, as for men, the only safe rule to obey is "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." The spirit of war has led to the fact of war. A long

course of psychological inflammation has finally broken through the skin and discharged its vile products. The idea of power, profit and welfare obtained through the use of force must henceforth be discredited, and the minds of the nations be given to an organisation of Europe, which will prevent another terrible cycle of madness. Aggregations of families into villages, tribes, provinces, nations, point to a further aggregation into confederacies. The hasty aggregation into empires has turned out to be a false step made over and over again in all parts of the world. Never has an empire remained finally stable. All military empires have fallen; nations have survived. It lies with the British Empire to become an empire only in name, in spirit a confederacy of autonomous nations, or it too will follow in the wake of the long succession of failures, without evolutionary value.

The mind of the governments expressed itself in armaments; and these, rising higher and higher, have finally toppled over. For the mobilisation of armaments, hurried and threatening, produced the war. Neither side would risk losing a day's advantage.

IS THERE A PLACE FOR FORCE?

12. Our testimony against all war must not, however, be extended to a testimony against all use of force. Force is always a poor and unsatisfactory expedient; it does not make for settlement and stability anywhere. Nevertheless it still has a lowly and diminishing place in human affairs. We use it with horses and dogs, and in the last resort with children. We use it with drunkards, criminals, lunatics, and with all sons of Belial, we live in comfort under police protection, we prosecute offenders. In uncivilised countries we might even have to meet criminal violence more directly than we do at home. We have never taken up the position of Tolstoy, who was against all government. Even in the schools which he established for village children no child was obliged to learn anything or to behave in a schoolroom manner. They might and did kick in a heap on the floor when they were not interested. All Tolstoy's intellectual positions are ultimate ones, properly called ideals. They rarely have their bases fixed in the firm ground of experience. They are akin to the cloud-clapped towers, the dream worlds of the imagination. A great creative

artist, living in the world of his imagination so vividly that he has scored the minds of his readers deep with the impressions he has brought thence, in "the light that never was on sea or land."

But when his imaginative ethic had to be realised—when counts had to become peasants, authors had to have no property in their books, when Russian Liberal Governments and Hague Conferences were held to be mere tainted compromises, then even an affectionate disciple realises that he must go to Tolstoy for his boiler power, but not for steering gear.

Therefore I do not think it best to describe our attitude as one of non-resistance, common as it is to do so. Besides the resistance against violence which we all make officially through the police, it is not difficult to imagine cases in which the lives, and more than the lives, of our families, or of helpless people, the aged, or women, or children, dependent upon us could be saved only by a sufficient use of force upon the criminal aggressor. It is never wise to enclose a positive principle in the form of a negative prohibition. A definite command, exact to the letter, that no force should ever be used in resistance to violence and wrong, is too mechanical to meet every case. We must,

then, express our Christian duty by some positive law, adaptable to circumstances; and I find that in the Law of Lovingkindness. If we keep that as our central motive in dealing with all our fellow creatures, we shall have a sufficient guide.

If we seek for some definite point below which force is proper, but above which it should be avoided, it must be found by considering the psychology of the person to be coerced. The lunatic, the criminal, and to a less extent the animal or the child, have to be coerced just so far as they cannot respond to a higher motive. That is to say we ought never to apply force where there is the power of appreciating and being influenced by reason, justice, shame, mercy, or a sense of duty, and where there is time to call out such motives. These ought to be tried so far as they will go, and they will go much further than the thick thumb of mankind has usually probed. With violent criminals particularly—who are grown men in possession of all their faculties—the records of the Society show many decisive victories of the spirit of love.

No one will suppose for a moment that the civilised nations of Europe are composed of people not amenable to the higher call. In

daily life in all countries they behave themselves under moral restraint, and in very much the same way in all. This is clearly a region in which the appeal to force is no longer appropriate. There is something better than force to appeal to in all countries, and there is no reason why the morals of the average individual should not, in the long run, be represented in the morals of the Government. Nations when at peace do not come under the same class as lunatics. This is the central reasoned foundation of our testimony against war, while we admit that force cannot be abolished altogether. War is behind the times, lower than the level which human nature in civilised lands has reached. What wants mending is the bad mechanism of Government. The nations are still organised on lines of war, with armies and navies, generals and admirals, emperors, and war offices. The next stage is to establish a mechanism built to manufacture peace. It would fit the modern world. It may be said safely that now no Democracy will fight of its own accord for aggression, but only when it believes that it is fighting in self-defence. Doubtless when war has begun, the soldier has under his military oath resigned into the hands

of his superiors such natural motives of humanity as would weaken his fighting efficiency. Brute force has resumed its sway on both sides. For non-combatants in danger from hostile troops the comity of nations, international law and the dictates of Christianity all prescribe abstinence from violence.

The obedience of the soldier cannot be avoided if we are to have military action at all. Any emancipation of his will is a dangerous idea to play with. If the soldier is to exercise his judgment, he, and not the civil authority rules the country. We are landed at once in a military dictatorship, the worst known form of Government, one which failed even in the noble hands of Cromwell.

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE WAR.

13. The distinction in many people's minds between offensive and defensive war is so decisive that we cannot omit to consider it. Almost everybody in this country would say that they wholly disapprove of aggression, but that to defend their hearths and homes is a different matter and might become the only right course. This thought is carried so far nowadays that no nation avows in its official utterances any

aggressive design, however plain such may be to other nations and to the more instructed of its own people. Everywhere each nation has to be persuaded that the war of the moment is strictly a war of defence ; so that now every war becomes a " war of defence " on both sides. There is no single one of the combatants in the present European struggle who does not claim to be on the defensive, and to have been driven into war by the necessity of maintaining their homes or their manner of life. This is something gained. It was not always so. The flatterers of Sennacherib would probably have insulted him if they had suggested that he was anything but a mighty conqueror. No such scruples attended the career of that great conquering state whose laureate poet bade them always " spare the conquered and war down the proud." Such was Virgil's forecast of the destiny of Rome.* The Treitschke

* The nobly sonorous lines are in *Æneid* VI., 847-853, and are part of the well-known speech of Anchises to his son Æneas in reference to the future city.

Excudent alii spirantia mollius aera
 (Credo equidem) vivos ducent de marmore vultus.
 Orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
 Describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent.
 Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento
 (Hæc tibi erunt artes) pacisque imponere morem,
 Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos.

school of German writers alone in modern days maintains unblushingly this tradition.

We shall not be able therefore to accept at their face value all defensive wars. The present war is a strictly defensive one for Belgium only. It may be described as a hypothetically defensive one for Great Britain, on the theory, for which there is not sufficient proof, that a victorious Germany intended afterwards to attack England. All the other rivalries of Europe contain an element of attack on both sides. In the strife of Slav and Teuton we cannot discover a wolf and a lamb. The Boer War, which looked like an attack by a great empire upon a small free nation, was more accurately a contest for supremacy between two white races, neither of which had any particular right to be where it was. Wars of pure defence were, however, much commoner in the past, when conquest was blunt and unashamed. Harold at Hastings, the French at Agincourt, and the Swiss at Sempach, were fighting in wars of pure defence. These battles were in the sequence of Marathon and Salamis. Many other wars have appeared defensive for a time on one side, as when Hannibal was in Italy or when Scipio was in Africa; but these

were merely parts of a war for domination. As conquest becomes recognised to be futile and obsolete, wars of pure defence will become obsolete too.

In the one case now so vividly before us, it is not uninteresting to notice that if Belgium had kept no army and no fortresses, but had instead relied, however vainly, upon the good faith of her guarantors and upon their mutual watch upon each other, she would have lost no honour and yet not been ravaged. The unscrupulous Germans, breaking her neutrality, would have marched through her land, paying for the damage they caused, and the campaign would probably have been in France. Belgium had no honourable duty to assist one side rather than the other, and was not a party to their quarrels. In the case of a small country whose force is bound to be unequal to her defence, unarmed neutrality is her safest refuge.

If we are pushed to the terrible alternative of non-resistance to an actual domestic invader, our action will depend on the extent to which we have become livingly impregnated with the spirit of Christ. We cannot bring His name into our compromises. But doubtless there

would be compromises. There are no Quakers in Belgium. But if there had been what would they have done last autumn? Some, if we may judge from English action, would have fought with the rest—some also would have made in Christ's name no resistance whatsoever. The remainder would have taken service with the State in helpful and necessary ways, not implying a personal share in killing. Temperament and variety of conviction would have led to varying responses to the tragic issue. Under international law, had that been observed, the non-combatants would have saved their lives. In the actual sack of eastern Belgium, they would have had no such selfish temptation.

The Society of Friends then, as a body, has no tolerance for war, whether offensive or defensive. Individuals would take lines of their own. The imperative law of the purified soul, on which the lineaments of Christ have been impressed, must prevail, where it conflicts with what would otherwise be the imperative call to national or local co-operation. This does not fit the world's immediate pattern, but we can only change the pattern by refusing to use it, and if need be by suffering for doing so.

The present war is not to be accounted for

as a simple disagreement between Germany and Great Britain. It is the outbreak and the result of a bad system of international relations, in which diplomacy is ultimately based on fleets and armies, and the amount of force behind an ambassador is what gives weight to his views. The whole system of Europe has been distrustful, full of ambition and fear; all foreigners have been regarded as potential enemies until mutual self-interest turns them into allies; the worship of force has been highly organised, and the religion of the states of Europe has been, in effect, Diabolism.

We Friends are hostile to all this from its beginning to its consummation. In so far as our own country has been a partner in it, as it has, we are isolated from our own country also. (This is true, even though it is not possible for a single country to isolate itself from the system.) When, therefore, the system explodes, we are consistent in maintaining our attitude of isolation and disapproval, and in spending our strength in working for a better order. The claim of the nation is no longer the highest with us because it has denied the highest.

Nevertheless we recognise that the fleet and the army could not be disbanded to-morrow,

and we do not feel it necessary to condemn our government or our nation on current standards ; but our standards are not theirs. This position has been forcibly expressed by the late Caroline E. Stephen, in her well-known book, " Quaker Strongholds " (page 120, cheap edition ; page 135, original edition), as follows:—

" To abstain, on these grounds, from all participation in warfare is surely a quite different thing from laying down any general theory as to the ' unlawfulness ' of war. I own that it does not appear to me to be right or wise to blame those who are acting in obedience to their own views of duty, however much they may differ from our own. I do not think it can serve any good purpose to ignore the force of the considerations by which war appears to many people to be justified. I would myself even go further, and admit that, under all the complicated circumstances of the world (including historical facts and treaty obligations), there are cases in which men may be actually bound to fight in what they believe to be a just cause ; although it does not, I believe, follow that every individual would be justified in taking part in such warfare. Would any one say that at the time of the Indian Mutiny the

Governor-General of India ought not to have permitted the use of arms for the protection of the women and children? I doubt whether any Friend would be found to maintain this. But it is equally to be remembered that no true Friend could well have occupied the position of the Governor-General. No nation which had from the beginning of its history been thoroughly Christian could, I suppose, have found itself in the position which we occupied in India in 1857. Were all the world, in the true and full sense of the word, Christian, such events obviously would not occur. Had we been from the first a thoroughly Christian nation, our whole history must have been different, and would (as we Friends believe) have been infinitely nobler."

THE SOLDIER AND THE POLICEMAN.

14. The difference between military action and police action was faced early by Friends. Isaac Penington, always a leading spokesman for the Society, wrote a pamphlet, "Somewhat Spoken to a Weighty Question concerning the Magistrates' Protection of the Innocent."* This

* In his "Collected Works."

work deals carefully with the relationship of the forcible coercion of criminals to the Christian law of love. Penington contemplates the case of those who "are forbidden by the love and law of God written in their hearts to fight for themselves" even against criminal violence. He says that "fighting is not suitable to a gospel spirit, but to the spirit of the world and the children thereof. The fighting in the gospel is turned inwards against the lusts, and not outward against the creatures." In reply to the criticism that under this scheme non-combatants are yet receiving the benefit of a protection to which they do not contribute, he points out that the path of moral advance must be gradual, and must begin with individuals. "This blessed state which shall be brought forth in the general in God's season must begin in particulars, and they therein are not prejudicial to the world, but emblems of that blessed state which the God of Glory hath promised to set up in the world in the days of the gospel." This argument is not nowadays particularly needed over the question of police protection, on which general agreement exists, but one has often to meet it concerning the protection afforded

by the Army and Navy, from which the man of peace cannot help, as a citizen, receiving protection. The moral sense of our population is represented by a long and wavering column, pushed back and forward, and the whole nation can only act at or behind the centre of gravity of the column. Nevertheless those who are working at the head of the line for better things are the greatest helpers of the nation. Isaac Penington proceeds : " For if righteousness be the strength of a nation and the seed of God the support of the earth, then where righteousness is brought forth, and where the seed of God springs up and flourishes, that nation grows strong." In the course of this paper he says : " I speak not against any magistrates or peoples defending themselves against foreign invasion or making use of the sword to suppress the violent and evil-doers within their borders, for this the present state of things may and doth require." It is a perfectly sensible and necessary concession to say that no one could expect the Army and Navy to be disbanded—the convictions of men remaining as they are. But he goes on : " There is a better state which the Lord has already brought some into, and which nations are to expect and travel towards."

Hence we conclude that we must above all things avoid universal military compulsion ; we must respect and value sensitive and highly trained consciences and wish them success in their aims.

THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

15. We cannot go far in this subject without encountering the problem of the limits of the right of the State over the individual. In religion as in marriage the State is an intruder. The reason is that these matters are sacredly individual, and that they have only an indirect bearing upon the welfare of the public. The state is concerned with our outward relationships. We are here regarding the State not as a beneficent organ of co-operation such as it is coming to be ; we are not thinking of the collectivist activities of the public as a whole ; we are thinking of the State as power, to use Treitschke's phrase, and we want to know the limits of its coercive functions. We venture to draw the line at the interference of the State with conscience. It is not possible to be rigid in this definition, for conscience may become eccentric and ill-directed and may rebel unreasonably.

The tendency of late has been in the direction of insubordination. The passive resisters to the Education Bill, the Suffragettes, the Irish Party formerly and the Ulster Party recently, are examples of disobedience to the State, which have not received general approval. Political advertisement for the cause at stake is a motive in them all. They are in regions usually left under public control.

The Society of Friends in the past has been prominent in its refusal to acquiesce in the ways of the Government in four points :—

(1) When the Government insisted on attendance at the services of the Church of England Friends endured a bitter persecution for a whole generation for refusing to obey, and finally won their fight in the Toleration Act. They bore the brunt of the Nonconformist battle in the Restoration period, a fact not generally realised.

(2) They refused to recognise marriage by a priest, and the law in reply refused to sanction their marriages performed in any other way. Quaker marriages were, therefore, illegitimate to begin with, but as early as 1661 the Law decided in their favour, and Friends ceased to suffer this great hardship.

(3) Friends refused to take judicial oaths. This practice not only reverses New Testament instructions, but establishes a double standard of truthfulness. The gradual legal recognition of affirmation registers their victory, which began in 1689 and ended in 1888. After two hundred years' experience in England and America, with perjury not uncommon, no one is known to have affirmed falsely.

(4) They refused to pay Church rates and tithe to maintain the established Church, and for several generations, until the latter half of the nineteenth century, they submitted to the distraint of their goods in consequence. On Church rates they won in 1868, but on tithe the economic entanglement has been too much for them; and the Government has won its battle by putting the tithe not upon the tenant but upon the landlord, as a tithe rent charge. In any case the rent was lower, the value of the land was lower, it had been bought cheaper because of the liability to tithe, so that the Friend actually found himself endeavouring in theory to make an illegitimate profit out of his refusal, though in practice distraint and law are not cheap. The matter has now settled down and payment is regularly made,

it being felt that the landowner is not, and never has been, the owner of the tithe; and that all land has been bought and is held subject to it. The landlord is only the vehicle of payment. These four examples seem to point to where an individual can, and cannot revolt.

Should it come to a question of compulsory military service, the refusals to serve from among the Society of Friends would be almost universal. That is a personal matter, as has been elsewhere explained. On the other hand they pay war taxes, and the following reasons may be given for such action :—

Firstly, we cannot discriminate between the portion of our tax which goes for war purposes and that which does not, and even if we could find a proportion and only pay accordingly, since the Government has no separate income account for war charges, we have no reason for believing that we should deduct anything from the particular expenditure which we dislike. This is the decisive argument. The ordinary national revenue we are in duty bound to support.

Secondly, the tithe analogy holds here. All business payments are regulated on the basis of taxation as it stands. Every bargain takes

a tax into account. Indirectly the Income Tax affects salaries and prices, and refusal to pay would in fact be attempting to get an unfair advantage, inasmuch as full payment has been already allowed for in our financial arrangements.

Thirdly, the fact that we could not escape payment if we tried, until all our goods were sold up and we as paupers were no longer liable to taxation, whilst not an argument to be pushed to the end nor sufficient of itself, does reasonably make us hesitate before embarking on a resistance which, even if spiritually justified, would certainly be economically futile.

Fourthly, we are compelled to receive the protection which the Army and Navy provide, and it seems a natural corollary from that that the payment for it should also be compulsory. Yet beyond all question the surest condition of safety in Europe would be the total absence of armies and fleets. We can be embarrassed in practice or in argument if you alter one only of the conditions, but if we had our way altogether, no one can gainsay its practical excellence.

On the whole, then, in stepping from conscription to the income tax, we are stepping

from what mainly concerns the individual to what mainly concerns the State.

We may fairly go much further along with our fellow citizens in a country in which we have a share in the government than we need go under an autocracy. In this country we ourselves are the governing order; and after we have given our vote it is right, unless in very extreme cases, to abide by the national decision until it actually touches the sensitive places of the inward man. If we lived in Russia, we should be much less responsible for the actions of the State and so be much more free to defeat them if we could.

WAR AS A MORAL TONIC.

16. He who would deny that war can ever be a builder of good character has against him no mean array of testimony. All literature which treats of war, with exceptions notable through their very fewness, treats it as a cause and a sign of central nobility of character. As an exception stands "The Trojan Women" of that terrible and unpopular truth-teller, Euripides.* There are also in quite

* Price 1s. Geo. Allen and Unwin.

modern days, other realistic records like his.* But Homer and Virgil, Shakespeare and Spenser, Bunyan and Scott, thought far otherwise, with all the ballad writers, romancers and chivalric poets. The Psalms are full of war, "The Wars of Arthur and Roland" made even John Ruskin, that great prophet of peace, hesitate puzzled.† This ancient testimony must be believed as true in its day. Modern tenderness had not yet arrived. Human personality had not yet become the centre of social devotion, and recognised as the gateway to God; and the feeling of human brotherhood which follows that faith had as yet little vogue. Humanity has of late appreciated in value as tribal gods have faded away, with their celestial sanction to hatred. As States and Empires have increased, war has had less connection with the safety of hearth and home, and its root in greed and ambition has become more plain.

War has always been the greatest of sports—a game played with the last and highest stakes. Beside the excitement of it hunting and Alpine

* Such as Tolstoy's "War and Peace," or Zola's "Débacle."

† See Appendix to "Crown of Wild Olive."

climbing become child's play, and cricket an affair of the drawing room carpet. All that sport is generally allowed to do for character war does, or did, more. And, in addition, behind it lay at the back of the warrior's mind some loyalty believed to be worth dying for. Every soldier is pulled up to a certain point of self-control, toughness, courage, alertness, and general character, and those who start below that level will still find a moral tonic in war.

There we must stop. Beyond that modest level of attainment, war begins to do character harm. It levels down as well as up. Its mechanical uniformity is deadening, initiative (especially in privates) is atrophied. Every man who has handed himself over to the machine has but little use for his higher brain centres. Our professional officers are generally good fellows, but few of them think: they are simple loyal men for the most part, in England modest and likeable, but it embarrasses and distresses them to face intellectual exercises. Where militarism has become perfected and is the main national cult, the officers are brutalised by pride and power. In war we see every kind of violent villainy rampant—murder, robbery, the ruin of

homes, of women, of whole provinces, ferocious charges of men about to die, lying reports, the daily sight of wholesale horror and the making of more. Sympathy, hard hit and exhausted, flees away, and no man can live unless he become hardened to suffering. The chained devil within becomes, for a time, master again. The man is henceforth like a beast who has tasted blood. He becomes like a demoralised collie who has once worried a sheep, and it will cost him an effort to get his mind out of uniform when he returns home. He bears in him for life a soiled imagination.

Nevertheless he has counted not his life dear unto himself, he is (we assume in the typical case) a brave man: and I count courage the central quality of a man's make-up, as love and purity of a woman's. Physical courage, at any rate, a soldier learns.

Can Peace provide scope for these things,—for honour and sacrifice, for courage and the risks which high sport brings? Only, I think, if held as a faith single-mindedly, not as an opportunist or an economist holds it. "For God and Man" is a loftier cry than "For King and Country." To treasure the integrity of the Christ within is to cherish a vestal fire not less

dear than the hearths of private homes : to go to prison for refusing conscription may be harder than to hold a trench. The contempt of one's mates puts a man into the firing line. To face a mob has its risks.

Moreover, our ordinary industrial life, in workshops, among furnaces, on railways, in drains, on the ocean, is always turning up heroes. So long as diseases are fatal and infectious, but must be nursed, so long as Society suffers from poverty, from drink and degrading vice, the need for Paladins, for knights errant and honourable women, presses daily upon us. Not war alone demands that men "live dangerously" and dare great adventures. Courage and risk and sacrifice are needed in all high emprise, in the effort to explore the secrets still hidden from science—to learn to make more beautiful things—to plead with, persuade and strive with men.

POSSIBLE LINE OF PROGRESS THROUGH INTERNATIONAL FORCE.

17. The practical problem of citizenship was faced afresh by a Peace Conference held by a large body of Friends at Llandudno in Sep-

tember of 1914, at the end of the second month of the war.* A group of Friends specially interested in the question considered the attitude which we ought to take towards our Government at the present crisis, and it will be instructive to quote the greater part of that group's report. It was not intended to bind the Conference, much less the whole Society of Friends.

"We must remember that we cannot realise our vision at once. Our reach must exceed our grasp. The best we can do is not always the best we can see. What is sometimes spoken of as 'compromise' may not be compounding with evil, but obtaining the greatest achievable instalment of good. The test of a change of position is not whether it reaches the goal at one bound, but whether it is a movement towards the ideal. For example, some friends of peace in Continental States where conscription now exists advocate a small national militia with six months' service, raised compulsorily by ballot. In such countries it might, conceivably, be a forward, while here in England it would clearly be a backward, step.

* * * *

The moral relation of the Christian to his State and city will, however, be one of co-operation and leavening from within. It is by this method that his contribution towards the transformation of human society into harmony with the Divine Will can usually best be made.

* See the report of it edited by Edward Grubb, published under the title "Friends and the War," for 1915. (Headley Brothers.)

Only he must keep his ideal steadily before him, and always "hitch his waggon to a star."

* * * *

Difficult decisions as to the application of these principles have to be made when considering the measure of assent which, in the present imperfect ethical development of human society, may rightly be given to the use of force in such matters as dealing with criminals, with rioters, with slave traders, and with a State which commits a violent breach of international obligations.

Force is no remedy. The spirit of violence or of war can only be conquered by love. But the use of force may be necessary to restrain violence and anti-social acts on the part of an individual, so as to give the opportunity for the process of reform and redemption. We must not, however, be satisfied to look upon it, even in civil concerns, as anything but a temporary and a hateful expedient. Its application must be calm and impartial. Its tendency to degenerate into violence must be watched and resisted. We must ever keep steadily before us the aim of appealing to that spark of goodness in every human being which the breath of love may fan into a purifying flame. We must seek to purge our penal system, both in its conception and in its administration, from every trace of passion, vindictiveness, or hatred.

The present war has been brought about in part by groupings of States, acting in their own selfish interests, or in pursuit of some illusory balance of power. At its close it may be possible to replace these by some kind of International Federation. To secure its establishment it may be found necessary to assent to its being provided with an executive arm, in the nature of an international police force, to enforce its decisions against a recalcitrant State. The way in which the awards of

arbitration tribunals have almost uniformly been accepted by litigant States in the past encourages us to hope that the use of such a force would only be necessary, if at all, in the early stages of such an institution.

But, if force is to be used, only as a last resource and as the least desirable of instruments, to secure compliance with a judicial decision or the considered determination of a Parliament of Free States, we think it might rightly be assented to on the same grounds as in civil affairs, and subject to the same governing principles and limitations. We must, however, never lose sight of our conviction that force has no permanent place in the Christian scheme of international relationships. We must carefully scrutinise the occasions and the manner of its employment, and seek to foster an ever-increasing reliance on the part of international opinion and good will."

* * * * *

Let it be remembered that the choice would not lie between an international force and no force, but, in our time, at any rate, between an international and a number of purely national forces. The nations might be asked to pool their forces in proportion to their population, and to keep no others.

But the obstacles to this plan and the objections to it, both theoretical and practical, are so numerous and cogent that it does not appear to me to be at all a probable line of advance.

How difficult it would be to persuade our own country to do without an overwhelming fleet, or Russia or Germany to do without a vast army ; and unless some great spiritual change intervenes we cannot envisage the Balkan populations disarmed. Only experience of the safety of the European comity, and a complete change of national temper, would bring this about. The nations would be likely at present to refuse to enter a scheme which placed their forces at the bidding of a Council of Europe at the Hague, whether at any time they agreed with its policy or not.

Again, at the beginning, the colonising powers, Great Britain, Russia, and France, would be sure to insist, not without reason, on keeping colonial contingents of their own to maintain order in their empires, and on their frontiers, in addition to the European quota. Similar pleas on a smaller scale would be made on behalf of Holland, Belgium and Germany. The system would break on the rock of empire. The complete security of a state of disarmament would not be felt, for Indian forces can be brought from Afghanistan to the Dardanelles.

Another serious danger must be faced. This plan would imply international control of the

unabsorbed tropics and international dealing with Persia, Siam, any portions of Turkey which remained independent, and also with China and Japan, if either or both of these were not within the confederation. Can the Powers be trusted to do justice collectively? The only steady characteristic of their changeable diplomacy has been their fatal, and, in the end, suicidal neglect of oppressed people.*

From these unabsorbed countries their present security, such as it is, derived from the jealousies of the European Powers, would be gone. I cannot help thinking that it would be found cheaper, and therefore more tempting, to exploit these countries by international capital wielding an international force than it is now. A great war between Europe and the yellow races is no inconceivable danger.

Voices have also been heard already, from the leaders of labour, expressing a fear lest the plan would mean further international co-operation of capital, working in many possible ways against the interests of labour. The introduction of Chinese gold-diggers to

* This stands out very clearly in the record contained in "The New Map of Europe," by Dr. Gibbons, an American. (Duckworth.) 1915.

South Africa is but a foretaste of possible developments among negroes, Hindoo coolies, Kanakas, and other helpless races, to their own injury and to the displacement of European labour.

It is also plain that the system would not work smoothly until the true spirit of co-operation between nations had come into being. Some agreement as to limitation of armaments would be part of the plan. The only method of limiting them would be on the basis of cost, and it would be always possible, by putting certain items to other accounts, or by building fortifications out of capital, or by borrowing in various other forms, to spend more than the permitted amount on armaments. The nations would always be watching each other. This is an extremely annoying process, derogatory to national dignity and easily leading to diplomatic bickering. Even more widely than such fraud itself the suspicion of fraud would extend.

In considering the ultimate sanction of a European decision, we must remember that before the dogs of war are loosed much coercion may be applied by means of a financial and economic boycott. There might be a total

stoppage of intercourse, of post and telegraph, of imports and exports, of cheques and credit. This is by no means an admirable situation. It would injure both parties to it, though no doubt a Power boycotted by six others would suffer more than any of the six individually. It would inflict hardship on the whole population. Still, war does all that and causes slaughter besides, and it would at least be a milder substitute for the mobilisation of forces.

This is a bad time to talk of the moral influence of other countries upon a nation determined to make war. Nevertheless the moral weight of a European decision must always be great, and in most cases would be decisive; in fact this kind of sensitiveness to one another's opinion is a condition of the success of working any kind of machinery for Peace.

On the whole, then, it would not seem to me probable that the line of improvement for which we hope will go by way of an international force. The matter is open to argument on both sides, and my own opinion has changed from what it used to be.* Certainly one's first

* It has been frequently noted that William Penn, in his proposals for a European Diet, looked forward to a European force for its sanction.

impulse is to catch at the analogy between the suppression of private war in favour of national law backed by the police, and the suppression of international war by international law similarly backed. But there are serious differences which in practice weaken this analogy. In the first place, the nations are much less numerous than the individuals. Among people counted by millions a small criminal class is fairly certain to exist, but among nations counted by a few dozen* it is much less likely that an ingrained criminal should appear. If you divide the population of Great Britain into groups of forty-eight, the vast majority of these groups would never need a policeman to keep them in order. But the case is much stronger than this, for nations do not die, whereas the generations of men succeed one another, and even if you could conceive one generation destitute of criminals, that would be no guarantee that the next would be similarly free. On the other hand among nations the prospect surely is one of increasing humanity and amelioration of character. Within a nation also, it is possible

* It is generally stated that there are forty-eight Sovereign States.

to separate a few people for magistrates and a few for police, but in the comity of nations the whole group is magistrate and policeman and plaintiff in one, and impartiality is, in consequence, much more difficult. Again, the causes which produce wars are for the most part non-judicial. It is impossible to imagine the establishment of a body of legal practice or routine which should decide such questions as those of Alsace, Persia, Morocco, Poland or Finland.

Whilst still open to change my opinion, I am, therefore, at present inclined to hope more from a less complete and less ambitious scheme. We might, and we must, earnestly try to induce the nations of Europe first to strengthen the Hague Court if it requires it, and to agree beforehand to submit to it all judiciable disputes such as the interpretation of treaties, or the delimitation of boundaries. Secondly there should be established in permanence a Council of Conciliation consisting of men in varying numbers from the larger and the smaller powers, whose appointments would not be for the definite issue, but for a period of years, who would not necessarily be diplomatists, but men chosen for their standing in their own country and abroad.

before such a body all the signatory powers would bind themselves to present subjects of dispute, and not to make war until the decision of this Council had been given. They would also bind themselves to obey such a decision. In the case of a rebel nation, the Council would be free to bring such moral or material pressure as the Powers thought right to influence or coerce the transgressor. The nations would still possess, we hope on a greatly diminished scale, their own armies or navies. If a dispute arose in which neither party agreed to appeal to the Council, the Council should have liberty to act on its own initiative. If one party appealed and the other did not, the pressure of the Council would be directed against the one who did not. This plan might not prevent all wars, but it would form an extraordinarily valuable mechanism of peace, against which the makers of war would find it difficult to have their way.

THE ULTIMATE VISION.

18. It is well thus carefully and tentatively to discuss the possibilities of the future as practical men, not hoping for too much, and

thankful for a little step in the right direction. But our hope penetrates much higher than this. This does not satisfy our vision. Far more deadly is our real attack upon war. We know that the safest plan of all, and the cheapest, is to have no armies or navies at all. Then no man need be afraid. It is only upon itself that militarism feeds. Take away its diet and it dies.

There are no longer left in the world warlike savages numerous enough to threaten civilisation. If Kurds or Turcomans or Afghans disturbed the slumbers of London and Paris they could be guarded against. China would be only too glad to return to the epoch of peace which preceded the attack of Europe upon her. Japan, we are assuming, would be within the region of disarmed peace. Let this vision once strike upon the suffering peoples of Europe, and let it find them sufficiently organised to put their purpose into action, and war is doomed. The years of prostration, poverty and bereavement which will follow this war will be a time in which this hope will be received more gladly than it has ever been. A bankrupt world will be teachable on lines of wisdom like these. Man needs a new and mighty Evangel, he needs a new

crusade, a new body of preaching Friars, a renaissance of the soul. Perhaps this is one of the few cases in all experience in which a complete and drastic remedy is easier than half measures; for such an appeal would have behind it all the power of a passionate emotion, all the energy of a new-found joy. Would that the tide of peace sentiment which will assuredly appear before long might rise high enough to flood every barrack and foreign office in Europe.

OBSTACLE I.

THE LACK OF A STRONG DEMOCRACY.

19. The central difficulties in the way of such a gospel of good tidings are mainly three: (1) the lack of an organised and conscious democracy in the east of Europe; (2) the struggles of oppressed nationalities; and (3) a wrong political theory of conquest. Immanuel Kant, in his essay on Universal Peace, postulated democratic governments first. Autocrats and bureaucrats can never be trusted. Most of the wars of the world have been brought about by the existence of ambitious and selfish men, to say nothing of fools, lunatics and actual criminals, on the

thrones of Europe. Royal families, whose members live an unnatural life, must always be in danger of producing characters like these to the ruin of the nations. It is, nevertheless, my opinion that we cannot wait for complete internal readjustments of this kind before we attempt to push our Peace proposals to the uttermost. There are other serious faults in Society which help to make war. Edw. Carpenter, in his recent book on "The Healing of the Nations," ascribes all war to the exploitation of the poor by the rich, and would try to abolish vicious class distinctions in the interests of Peace among nations. It is common to hear people say that so long as our organisation of society at home is so bad, and the distribution of wealth so unequal, we cannot hope to put down war. I desire to put in a plea against this order of procedure, and against waiting for a tarrying democracy before we attempt to organise the nations. Changes come one at a time. We shall, I trust, abolish or vastly diminish war before we are all Socialists living in collectivist democracies. Of all the great evils of the world, war is the next due to be abolished. Poverty will outlast war, and so will monarchy. War is so wasteful, so mad,

so hostile to all that we value in character, it is so plainly a feature of a savage past, that it will be wise to concentrate effort on its abolition rather than sit with folded hands or dissipate effort too widely, till all else of human ill is on its way to cure. Almost all people are in their hearts against war. Nearly everybody hates it or disapproves of it, and men only accept it because they believe they are helpless under necessity. War is no longer a natural function of human nature in civilised lands. Human nature has grown out of war. War in Europe is due to the bad mechanism of government, and when a great institution is dependent upon the bad mechanism of another series of institutions it is doomed. On the other hand the capitalist system of production has, with all its evils, the general support of the majority of Englishmen. There are, again, in every country large bodies of people who believe in autocracy or in aristocracy as the organ of government. Perhaps over half of the people of Europe would be found to be of this opinion. On the whole, then, I should not feel inclined to be dismayed or to pause because of the difficulties which Peace has to confront from the lack of human freedom still prevailing in many countries.

OBSTACLE II.

THE EXISTENCE OF CONQUERED NATIONS.

20. Our second obstacle is the fact that there can hardly be permanent peace so long as the consciousness of nationality is widely denied. Nationalism, like "love" or "religion," may be a good or an evil thing. When it means national aggrandisement, contempt of other nations, the desire to assimilate them or to erect tariffs against them, it has become a dangerous evil, but when it is struggling to be itself it is wholly justified. A nation is an entity *sui generis*. It need not be identical with a race. Belgium and Scotland contain at least two races each. It need not have one language. Belgium again has two and Switzerland four. But a stable nation will have most of such elements as a common race, a common language, a common history and tradition, a single government and (the only absolute essential) a sentiment of self-consciousness. Europe is really in its present trouble because the nationalities of the East of Europe have been in bonds. Germany has governed Danes and Poles and French, Austria has governed Serbs and Czechs and Poles, Roumanians, Croats and Italians, Russia

has governed Finns and Poles and Roumanians, Turkey has governed Bulgars, Serbs and Greeks, and all these Powers have governed badly, have attempted to destroy the language and the national feeling of the conquered races; and with such exceptions as that of the Poles in Galicia they have been denied full and free citizenship.

It is a strange fact that nations do not die. Centuries of oppression have not destroyed Poles, Bulgars, Serbs and Roumanians. The Irishman, the Scotchman and the Welshman show little sign of absorption even in the friendly English stock. But all Empires die. Political history records little else than their rise, strength and decay. The story of human evolution through long ages is the story of a perpetual increase of the size of the unit within which there is peace. The family has consolidated into the tribe, the tribe into the province, the province into the nation. Over and over again the false step into empire has been made and has been retraced. Not even a thousand years of Rome have made Europe into a Roman nation. Nor did a second millennium of the Eastern Empire leave a united nation centring at Constantinople. The next step in the integration of peoples is the step of Federation, and only on these lines will

Great Britain escape the doom of her great fore-runners. Let us then in all European settlements cease to ignore, as the diplomatists have consistently done in the past, the claims of nationality, even in conquered and defeated peoples. Let this be the steady purpose before our minds.

OBSTACLE III.

A WRONG THEORY OF CONQUEST.

21. The third difficulty is the current doctrine of Empire. On all sides we hear that Germany has "got" Alsace-Lorraine, that Austria "wants" Salonica, that Germany "wants" Antwerp and Belgium, that to "acquire" the tropical colonies is the motive at the back of German aggression, and so forth. It is supposed that the country which "gets" those advantageous ports or colonies will carry on more trade and grow rich. From the beginning to the end this is a delusion. To govern a country is one thing, to own it is quite another. Neither the government of France nor the government of Germany has ever owned or can ever own Alsace-Lorraine. It belongs to a number of holders of property who

are mostly its own inhabitants. If Germans expect to get tea and coffee from a tropical colony of theirs they will have to buy it from those who grow it, exactly as if it belonged to Great Britain. The German trading community in Antwerp is already large, and so long as we have Free Trade and free migration it is difficult to see how a government could make it larger or increase its prosperity. Great Britain does not own the wool of Australia. Englishmen buy it if they want it, and so do Germans at the same price and with the same facility. There is the gravest confusion in the popular mind between government control and economic exploitation, and all the national jealousies connected with trade are mischievous delusions. It would pay Great Britain extremely well to have the coast of Africa dotted with German colonies and German factories. Our merchants would buy such of their products as they wanted; it would be profitable to do so, and to sell in return English textiles or other home manufactured products. Cannot we all realize that a trade bargain is a double transaction, which is an advantage to both parties or it would not take place? It is nothing but good for us that Germans should make money. They are all the

better customers in consequence. In times of good trade within a nation everybody benefits and is glad. Activity in one kind of production scatters its benefits far and wide. When one trade does well another tends to do well too. The same process holds with regard to the world's trade. If Germany does well England and America will tend to do well. From a business point of view the nation which undertakes the administration of a tropical colony is doing an ill paid and expensive service to the rest of the world, and receiving in return not much more than a few berths for its civil and military servants, paid at first by the home tax-payer. I know of no conquest in modern times that has been economically worth while.*

The possibility of putting on a hostile tariff causes some qualification to all this, but nothing like so much as is generally believed. Curiously enough it is Germany who maintains Free Trade in her colonies, while France and Russia keep us out by tariffs, as do also our own colonies to a large extent. The preference given to British goods in Canada is such as to give us an advantage over other importers, but

* See J. A. Hobson, "Imperialism," Chap. II. and the author's "Evolution and Empire" (Headleys).

no equality with the home manufacturer. To understand how slight, though real, is the perversion and block caused by a tariff, we must realize that international trade pulses round the world, it may be in a long circuit which may include five or six countries. France prevents English silk going into Madagascar, and insists that only French silk shall go. So far it is a block to the English silk trade, but something comes from Madagascar to pay for that silk, say cocoanuts. Who buys these? They are sold to whoever will buy, and it is possible that someone in England is the buyer. Whom does England pay? She may easily pay in the form of machinery sent to France to make up to her for her silk exported to Madagascar. Thus, though the English silk trade suffers, the machinery trade gains. This is a short circuit consisting only of three exchanges. International trade is often far more complicated. All that a tariff does is to hinder the circulation of the blood of commerce at one point, and its principal effect is to make the protected article dear to the consumer and a source of artificial profit to the producer. But the circulation finds its way round by more devious arteries.

There are doubtless cases where a colony may be economically valuable only if, by European oversight, turbulent tribes can be repressed and the conditions favourable to business be established. The country which does this work of government obtains the first right to run mines and build railways in such a country. All the figures, however, show that these privileges by no means repay the cost of conquest and administration. The real point is that the latter are paid by the taxpayer, while the concessions go to a few wealthy firms. Great Britain, however, need not be afraid on this point. So much of the world is already under our control that the opportunities for the investment of capital there are far more numerous than we have yet taken up.

One further object of colonial expansion is supposed to be to find room for surplus population. Surplus population, however, is by no means bound to go to colonies controlled from home. Germans are as free as Englishmen to go to America. The state of Wisconsin and certain parts of the Argentine are predominantly German countries already. Forty German papers are published in the city of Philadelphia. Their own colonies they neglect. The extension

of manufactures in Germany has been so great that there was no surplus population even before the war. A million and a half Russians have to be brought in every autumn to reap the harvest. England, and to a less extent Germany, are following France in the diminution of their birth-rates.

We here become aware of the real reason for the desire for colonial possessions. The country whose citizens emigrate under foreign rule loses them as soldiers. They are for the most part only too pleased to escape from militarism. Not without reason do Army and Navy Leagues talk much of the expansion of their country as a world power. That is, nations fight to get colonies, and colonies are to grow fighters. Militarism exists to supply its own needs only. Let it, however, be clearly understood that the laws of economics and the laws of government work on different lines. No one buys an article because it is manufactured within the empire. No grocer can offer to buy Canadian condensed milk if Swiss condensed milk is better at the price. Competition in business takes place by means of samples and price lists. Business men keep no revolvers in their safes. Once let the peoples realize this simple doctrine and the

greatest hindrance to the reign of peace will be removed.

Protective tariffs are the outcome of the wrong theory of empire, and they perpetuate the evil thought which has given them birth. A tariff is always a mean thing. It says to the people whom it excludes that though they can make an article better and cheaper than somebody else at home, they shall not be allowed to earn a living by doing so. It is a form of hostility between nation and nation. It produces strongly entrenched rival interests and entangles politics and business, flavouring the mixture with the sauce of ill-will.

But its relation to nationalism is worth our enquiry. It is common for Protectionists to say that national patriotism is with them, and that a denationalised cosmopolitanism is the motive of Free Traders. Strange to say it is the artificial affinities and barriers caused by Protection which tend to prevent the natural coalescence of national units now separated.

Within the Russian tariff wall the Poles have become a great manufacturing community, supplying the empire and enriching themselves. The economic interests of Warsaw are directly opposed to its national aspirations, which

would lead it to reunion with the German and the Austrian Poles. The commercial connections of Alsace are chiefly with the German Rhine Valley, from which, as a French province, she would be excluded under Protection. The hinterland of Trieste is not Italian mainly; her interests as a port are in Austrian territory. Under Free Trade the spiritual reality which we call a nation would be able to realise itself unhampered by artificial business restrictions, and Free Trade would release their patriotic spirit. It would also remove many rivalries. Why must Serbia have a port on the Adriatic? In order that her market for swine may not be at the mercy of Austrian custom-houses. The rivalry for the possession of Salonica, which is mainly commercial, would vanish if trade were free to all.

WHY WE CANNOT ENLIST IN A "JUST" WAR.

22. A Friend of the present day, faced with the outward suggestion and its inward echo that it is his duty to help to save his country from the danger of defeat, or even of conquest, has a long Quaker tradition behind him. He is no pioneer. We are deeply indebted to the insight

of our forefathers in taking the initiative for us. But no tradition, however honoured, will really be enough to resist the pressure of living conviction. Refusal to enlist must be based upon something more intimate than a Quaker or a Christian tradition. Men will take liberties with a tradition. Fading words of Greek manuscripts, handed down through perilous centuries and copied into modern print, have not proved strong enough to withstand the flood of military feeling. We see that every day in the voluminous pulpit apologetic which defends war from the Christian standpoint, and in the strange refusal to grant validity to the teaching of Christ about the conduct of a man as a citizen, while admitting it in his private relationships. We must have something living to meet the living foe, and happily we have that living Presence. God has not left Himself without a witness. It is because we cannot defile the living Christ within that we cannot join in war. Our personality would be desecrated by its murderous servitude, because that personality has its birth and its home in the Indwelling God. This treatment is, I am glad to find, similar to the line taken by Caroline E. Stephen in "Quaker Strongholds," Chap V. I cannot hope to improve upon her clear and

beautiful treatment of the problems of war. The book is in many households, and this chapter is well worth reading again.

THE RELATIVITY OF MORAL OBLIGATION.

23. There is in morality nothing rigid and hardly any law that is universally applicable. Morality is a quality of the relation of a human being to his environment, and we must judge of the rightness or wrongness of an act, not by regarding the act alone in the absolute, classified among our pigeon holes of approval or disapproval, but by considering also the other side of the relation, the human being who commits the act. Of him alone, and of the spirit in which he acts, can the words right and wrong be asserted, for these words denote moral attributes, and can only be applied to a being who possesses moral attributes. The judgment of right or wrong must be applied in each case with reference to the time, the place, and the person. Whilst it may be necessary for the self-respect of a Somali warrior to kill a man and take his wife, and there may be no other way open to a well-bred savage of entering upon matrimony, such an act among us would

encounter numerous difficulties and need not be characterized.

This principle has a very immediate bearing upon the duty of the Christian in time of war. We can only expect a Government, which represents the centre of gravity of national opinion, to act in accordance with the views of the average man. If it did otherwise it would be hurled from power. Nevertheless as Christian men we cannot so wound the Christ within as to kill and destroy as a soldier must. Our individual standard may well remain different from the average standard of the nation. What is wrong for us may be right for the Cabinet.

Some may fear that this doctrine of the relativity of moral obligation weakens the force of its categorical imperative. On the contrary, its very suppleness enables it to press upon the conscience as a coat of mail presses upon the body more closely than a steel cuirass. We feel it more because it fits us better, and there are no ways of escaping it. But the case is far stronger than this. The whole chance of moral progress, upon which all our hopes are built, depends upon this very fitness of the call to the person called. If morals were absolute and rigid for all time, how could they grow? They only

grow because certain people in a community begin to find it wrong to do that which has hitherto been generally accounted right, and in time public opinion is raised and the moral standard placed at a different point. If we may not thus hope we are of all men most miserable. It may be urged that the moral standard may vary from time to time, but not at a given time from person to person. But this is impossible, for it is only by variation from person to person that variations from time to time are, or ever can be, brought about. Paul had this at the back of his mind in his famous contrast between the law and the gospel—the one rigidly fixed in tradition, the other a living growth. It still remains true in the field of morals that *noblesse oblige*.

This does not mean that everything that a nation decides to do at any time is to be counted right. A nation, like an individual, will do wrong unless it lives up to the highest accessible standard of justice and mercy. The historian will give his judgment upon national acts, but the judgment of God in the heart of every individual is a different matter, strictly personal to each. There is, in fact, an inward and an outward standard of rightness. According to

the inward standard, an act must be judged by the conscience. According to the outward, it must be judged by its consequences, in the largest sense of that word. The trouble is that these judgments do not always coincide.

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE.

24. It is widely hoped, even by those who believe that fighting is an immediate necessity, that Christianity will in the long run put down war. But such an enormous change as is implied in the abolition of war will have to be the result of a long period of work by a minority, and during that period the position of such a minority is necessarily anomalous and difficult. They find themselves under two conflicting laws, and they have to choose. The present resounds with the call of the nation, the future makes its distant but penetrating appeal through the still small voice of the Christ within.

We may be confronted, as the early Christians were by Celsus, with the question as to what the nation would do if a large proportion of it agreed with us and declined to go to the front. But it is not fair to assume that if a large minority, or a majority, of the nation agreed with us, circum-

stances such as the present would ever have arisen. All that we are called upon now to discover is some immediate solution for the present case. If a feeling for peace were so strong as is suggested in Great Britain, it would probably be strong in other nations also, and the combined efforts of persons so minded would probably be able to abolish war altogether. We must, in any case, look forward to that condition in the future, and for the present we must hold the trench with a thin line of defenders till the reinforcements of the next age arrive.

INDEX

- Abolition of armies and navies, 92.
- Absence of definite instruction on war in N.T., 12.
- Albigenses, 33.
- American Civil War, 49.
- Anabaptists, 33.
- Analogy between States and individuals misleading, 89.
- Ariosto on Constantine, 32.
- Armaments, toppled over, 57.
- Atrocities in war, 54.
- Bahais, 34.
- Barclay, Robert, on Christian Fathers, 27.
- Belgium's defence, 65.
- "Book of Discipline," 41, 42.
- Braithwaite, W. C., "Beginnings of Quakerism," 36, 39, 44.
- British Imperialism, 56.
- Burrough, Edward, epistle to garrison at Dunkirk, 37.
- Cathari, 33.
- Capital, collective, danger of, 86.
- Carpenter, Edward, 94.
- Causes of the war, 56.
- Celsus, 28.
- Centurions, 15.
- Christian Fathers, 23.
- Christianity, non-political 14; a ferment, 23; decadent during third century, 31.
- Clausewitz, on atrocities, 54.
- Cleansing of the Temple, 11.
- Clement of Alexandria, 26.
- Colonial forces necessary, 85.
- Colonies, military value of, 103.
- Conference at Llandudno, 82.
- Conquest and business, wrong theory, 98.
- Constantine, 23, 32.
- Council of Conciliation, 90.
- Council of Nicæa, 27.
- Cyprian, 26.
- Dante on Constantine, 32.
- Defensive war, 62.
- Democracy will not fight a war of aggression, 93.
- Diabolism, 6.
- Diplomacy, danger of collective, 86.
- Divine Presence, 8.
- Doukhobors, 34.
- Economic boycott, 87.
- Empires, a false step, 57; die, 97.
- Epistle, of George Fox in 1659, 59; of 1804, 42; of 1805, 42.
- Erasmus, 33.
- Essenes, 23.
- Force, in Europe, 55, 67; its proper place, 58, 61.
- Fox, family at Falmouth, 43.
- Fox, George, declines captaincy, 35; writes to Oliver on foreign policy, 36; advises William Penn, 36; illness at Reading, 38; epoch-making epistle, 39; declaration to Charles II., 41.

- Free Trade supports Nationalism, 104.
- Free Quakers, 49.
- Friends in France, 43; in American Civil War, 49; in Australia and New Zealand, 50; in present war, 52; resistance to the State, four cases, 73; pay taxes, 75.
- Franciscans, 33.
- "Fulfilment," wrong translation, 17.
- Gibbon, 28.
- Hague Conventions, 53; Court, 90.
- Harnack, 24.
- Heroism in peace, 80.
- Institutions due to individual convictions, 15.
- International force, 83, 84; objections to it, 85-88.
- Invasion of England, 65.
- Irenæus, 25.
- Irish Rebellion, 45.
- Justin Martyr, 25.
- Lactantius, 27.
- Law of loving-kindness, 60.
- Living Christ, 106.
- Lollards, 33.
- Luke xxii. 35-38. 16.
- Lurting, Thomas, 44.
- Marcus Aurelius, 30.
- Maryland, arbitration, 47.
- Mechanism of peace desirable, 61.
- Mennonites, 33.
- Military obedience, 62; value of colonies, 103.
- Milton on Constantine, 32.
- Moral tonic of war, 77.
- Moravians, 33.
- Mystical sects, 32.
- Nationality, *sui generis*, 96; does not die, 97.
- New England, Quaker experiences in, 45.
- No definite treatise on Christian duty, 13.
- "Non-resistance," unsatisfactory, 59.
- Origen, 26.
- "Owning" countries, wrong theory, 98.
- Paterines, 33.
- Peace at any price, 53.
- Penington, Isaac, address to the army, 40; on protection by magistrates, 69.
- Penn, William, his sword, 36; European diet, 88.
- Pennsylvania, 45-48.
- Preferential creditor in morals, 52.
- Primitive Christianity revived, 34.
- Quakerism, peace an early deduction from, 35; variety of utterance till 1659, 37; views on war not dependent on tradition, 106.
- Reasons for paying taxes, 75.
- Resist not evil, 9.
- Right and wrong relative to person, 107.
- Roman peace, 14.
- Royalty a danger, 94.
- Ruskin, hesitating on war, 78.
- Samaritans, 11.
- Scourge of small cords, 11.
- Sennacherib, 63.
- Sellar, Richard, 44.
- Sermon on the Mount, 8.
- Slav and Teuton, 64.
- Socialism will not precede peace, 94.
- "Southern Heroes in Wartime," 50.
- State and individual, 72.
- Stephen, Caroline E., "Quaker Strongholds," 68, 106.
- Surplus population, wrong theory, 102.
- Synod of Arles, 27.

Tariffs, wrong theory, 100.
Tatian, 25.
Taxes, Friends pay, 75.
Temptation of Jesus, 10.
Tertullian, 24, 26, 28, 29.
Texts, 12.
Thundering legion, 29.
Tithe, 75.
Tolstoi, 58.
Tragedy of the case, 51.

"Trojan women," 77.

Two swords, 16.

Virgil, 63.

Waldenses, 33.

War, a sport, 78; a degradation, 79;
obsolete, 95.

Wilson, W. E., "Christ and War,"
24, 33.

Books on the War.

ATONEMENT AND NON-RESISTANCE. By WM. E. WILSON, B.D. Cloth Boards, 1s. net ; paper covers, 6d. net.

CHRIST AND WAR. By WM. E. WILSON, B.D. A Peace Study Text-Book. Cloth limp, 1s. net ; cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.

CHRIST AND PEACE. A Discussion of some Fundamental Issues raised by the War. Cloth boards, 2s. net ; paper covers, 1s. net.

FRIENDS AND THE WAR. Addresses delivered at a Conference at Llandudno, September, 1914. Paper covers, 1s. net.

THE FRUIT OF HER HANDS ; and THE WAYS OF HER HOUSEHOLD. Two booklets by CONSTANCE SMEDLEY. 6d. net.

PERSONALITY AND NATIONALITY. By RICHARD ROBERTS. Cloth boards, 2s. net ; paper covers, 1s. net.

PACIFISM IN TIME OF WAR. By CARL HEATH. Cloth Boards, 2s. net ; paper covers, 1s. net.

CIVILISATION IN THE MELTING POT. By GEORGE A. GREENWOOD. With Preface by Arthur Ponsonby, M.P. Paper covers, 1s. net.

THE GRAPES AND THE THORNS ; Thoughts in Wartime. By GILBERT THOMAS. Cloth, 2s. net ; paper covers, 1s. net.

THE TRUE WAY OF LIFE. Third edition, rewritten and much enlarged. By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A. Cloth boards, 2s. net ; paper covers, 1s. net.

MOTHERS OF MEN AND MILITARISM. By FRANCES S. HALLOWES. 1s. net.

THE WORLD'S WAR, AND OTHER POEMS. By WALTER LONG. (In the press.)

Headley Brothers, Bishopsgate, London, E.C.

Pamphlets on the War.

LOOKING TOWARDS PEACE. Issued by the Peace Committee of the Society of Friends. 1d.

THE GREAT ADVENTURE IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By A. MAUDE ROYDEN. 2d. net.
(Cheaper form, 1d.)

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN THE PRESENT CRISIS. By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A. 2d. net.

THE CHRISTIAN'S PERPLEXITY. By JOHN E. MCINTYRE, M.A. 2d. net.

WOMEN AND THE WAR. By FRANCES S. HALLOWES. 2d. net.

"ON SERVICE." By E. S. WOODS, M.A. 3d. net.

THE EUROPEAN WAR. By the Editor of the "Friends' Quarterly Examiner." 2d. net.

A QUAKER VIEW OF THE WAR. By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A. 1d.

EVERYWOMAN AND WAR. By JOHN OXENHAM. 6d. net. (Also cheap edition 1d. ; special terms for quantities.)

THE MIGHT OF MAGNANIMITY. By G. T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B. 1d. net.

THE DARKEST HOUR, 1915. By O.G. ½d. (Special terms for quantities.)

DE BELLO MAXIMO. A Plea for clear thinking. By IMMO S. ALLEN. 1d. net.

CHRIST AND NIETZSCHE. A Criticism of the Will to Power. By EDWIN M. STANDING. 3d. net.

THE QUAKER CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE. A Challenge. By NORMAN ANGELL. 1d

Headley Brothers, Bishopsgate, London, E.C.



PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

H&SS
A
5979

